

# West Burton Solar Project

## The Applicant's Responses to Additional Submissions

Prepared by: Lanpro Services  
November 2023

PINS reference: EN010132  
Document reference: EX1/WB8.1.10

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010  
Rules 8(1)(c)



## Contents

<b><u>1</u></b>	<b><u>INTRODUCTION</u></b>	<b><u>3</u></b>
1.1	PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT	3
1.2	STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT	3
<b><u>2</u></b>	<b><u>THE APPLICANT'S RESPONSES TO PROCEDURAL DEADLINE A AND DEADLINE B SUBMISSIONS</u></b>	<b><u>4</u></b>
<b><u>3</u></b>	<b><u>THE APPLICANT'S RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL SUBMISSIONS BY INTERESTED PARTIES</u></b>	<b><u>107</u></b>

## Issue Sheet

Report Prepared for: West Burton Solar Project Ltd.  
Examination Deadline 1

### The Applicant's Responses to Additional Submissions

#### Prepared by:

Name: Stephen Flynn

Title: Senior Planner

#### Approved by:

Name: Jane Crichton

Title: Associate Director

Revision	Date	Prepared by:	Approved by:
Original	24 November 2023	SF	JC

## **1 Introduction**

### **1.1 Purpose of the Document**

1.1.1 This document provides West Burton Solar Project Limited (the 'Applicant's') response to those Additional Submissions (the 'AS's') and Procedural Deadline A (the 'PDA's') Submissions published by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) on 31 August 2023, and Procedural Deadline B (the 'PDB's') Submissions which were published by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) on 1 November 2023, relating to the Development Consent Order Application (the 'Application') for West Burton Solar Project (the 'Scheme').

1.1.2 A total of 60 PDA Submissions were submitted to the Examining Authority (ExA) by Interested Parties in response to Item 1 of Annex E of the ExA's Rule 6 Letter (dated 10 August 2023) **[PD-005]**. A total of 12 PDB Submissions were submitted to the ExA by Interested Parties in response to Item 3 of Annex C of the ExA's Rule 6 Letter (dated 10<sup>th</sup> October 2023) **[PD-006]**.

### **1.2 Structure of the report**

1.2.1 This document provides responses from the Applicant to those matters raised through Additional Submissions, Procedural Deadline A and Procedural Deadline B Submissions and is structured as follows:

- Section 2 provides the Applicant's responses to those Procedural Deadline A and B Submissions.
- Section 3 provides the Applicant's responses to those Additional Submissions made by Interested Parties.

## 2 The Applicant's Responses to Procedural Deadline A and Deadline B Submissions

### 7000 Acres [PDA-002]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
7A-01	The Scheme	Naming of the Schemes	<p>"Agenda Item 2</p> <p>The 7000 Acres Group write to submit the following issues in relation to the agenda items for the Preliminary Meeting 7th September 2023 as requested in the Examining Authority's rule 6 letter, dated 10th August 2023."</p> <p>"Agenda Item 2 The Examining Authority's remarks about the Examination process (refer to Annex B), including consideration of the interrelationship of Cottam Solar Project with other projects (refer to Annex C)</p> <p>The Preliminary Agenda Items 2 &amp; 4 refers to the interrelationship of the Cottam Solar Project with other projects.</p> <p>This is very confusing for all Interested Parties. Is this meant to refer to the West Burton Project? Is this a sign that like the residents and Interested Parties, The Planning Inspectorate is getting mixed up between the several projects in the West Lindsey District? If this is a 'cut &amp; paste' Rule 6 letter, as it would seem, Interested Parties are rightly confused and worried for the multiple Examinations ahead for the West Lindsey District. This fundamental error needs to be rectified and an immediate correction sent to all Interested Parties so they can address any responses to the ExA correctly."</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.
7A-02	The Scheme	Notifications	<p>"In this instance, Interested Parties have been directed incorrectly by the ExA. The 7000 Acres Group will transpose the West Burton Solar Project for the Cottam Solar Project for both these agenda items.</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>The region has a relatively high level of an aging population and added to this a high degree of low income households. Both these factors translate to lower levels of engagement in the examination. Furthermore, due to the dispersal of the effected communities across the West Lindsey District, there is an immediate disadvantage for residents and communities sharing information and understanding the collective impact of the four Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.</p> <p>The Examining Authority needs to be aware that for many residents and Interested Parties it is very difficult to participate in events held during the working week and during working hours. Also, many people in the region are not able to utilise the videoconferencing facility provided. Broadband coverage is often slow and irregular in this rural area.</p> <p>In terms of the interrelationship of the West Burton Solar Project with the other projects, it is important for the ExA to have regard to this unique and unprecedented concentration of four solar NSIP's within the District, in contrast to any other scheme(s) in the Country.</p> <p>The fact that there are four projects in the District effecting residents locally and regionally means that Interested Parties become confused which scheme they are referring to at times. The confusion is made worse with the projects having similar names. These elements combined to form barriers for Interested Parties to respond to the ExA."</p>	
7A-03	Policy		<p>"In terms of Government guidance and policy, the ExA for the West Burton Solar Project states that this application; 'includes development falling within Sections 14(1) and 15 of the Planning Act 2008.' The ExA's for the Gate Burton Project and Cottam Solar Project, also make this assessment for these Examinations. The Applicant for the Gate Burton Project states that no designated National Policy Statements apply to that particular</p>	<p>The Scheme is classed as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) pursuant to sub-sections 14(1)(a) and 15(1) and (2) of the Planning Act (PA) 2008 as an</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			Examination. The 7000 Acres Group agrees. Therefore, as all the applications fall under the same Act and sections therein, it is reasonable to conclude that no designated National Policy Statements apply to the West Burton Solar Project and indeed the Cottam Solar Project."	onshore generating station in England with a capacity exceeding 50 megawatts (MW).  Please refer to section 5.3.2 of the <b>7.5 Planning Statement [APP-313]</b> .
7A-04	Examination Process	Hearings and Examination Procedure	<p>"Agenda Item 4</p> <p>The Examination Authority's remarks about the draft Examination Timetable (refer to Annex E), including consideration of the interrelationship of the West Burton Solar Project with the other projects (refer to Annex C)</p> <p>It is noted and appreciated that the Examining Authority has 'sought to maximise the time between Deadlines and events by minimising the number of Deadlines', however on cross referring the three projects (Gate Burton, West Burton and Cottam) which are either in examination or moving into examination, it is evident from an Interested Parties perspective that the timetables are not reasonable or achievable.</p> <p>For instance and first of all, the week commencing 21st August, the Procedural Deadline A for both the Cottam Solar Project and the West Burton Solar Project occur on the 22nd August and the 24th August respectively. This same week, Hearings will be held for the Gate Burton Project, see below: Gate Burton Energy Park 22nd August - Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 22nd August - Open Floor Hearing 2 23rd August - Issue Specific Hearing 2 23rd August - Issue Specific Hearing 3 (session 1) 24th August - Issue Specific Hearing 3 (sessions 2 &amp; 3) 25th August - Accompanied site Inspection Therefore, in this first instance, the project</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to the dates by which the Gate Burton, Cottam and West Burton Applications were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, being 22 February 2023, 12 January 2023 and 21 March 2023 respectively. As per the National Infrastructure Planning Website, specifically the Frequently Asked Questions section under the 'Application Process' tab where 'FAQ38' expects the "<i>Pre-examination [stage] to normally take approximately three months to complete.</i>" Resultingly, the Applicant would have assumed that the Preliminary Meetings</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>timetabling crosses over. This means that moving forward there are multiple occasions when timetabling is unmanageable for Interested Parties affected by these projects.</p> <p>Secondly, both the Preliminary Meeting and first Open Floor Hearings will be held for the Cottam Solar Project and the West Burton Solar Project on the 5th &amp; 7th September with the Issue Specific Hearing 1 for the Cottam Solar Project on the 6th September. It is noted there is no Issue Specific Hearing 1 listed in the timetable for the West Burton Project. If this Hearing is required, Interested Parties must be informed as soon as possible and thus made aware of any timetabling implications and impacts. Please note that this week is also the start of the academic year for many local schools and colleges. This in turn means that many Interested Parties will not be able to attend these events. Prior to the above, Interested Parties, have a further deadline to meet on the 1st September (Deadline 3 - Post Hearing Submissions plus other items) for the Gate Burton Project.</p> <p>Thirdly, on the 3rd October responses are needed by the ExA to further written questions (ExQ2, if required) plus other comments for the Gate Burton Project with Hearings commencing the week of the 9th October and predicted to run until the 13th. On the 17th October, Deadline 1 for the Cottam Solar Project occurs with requirements for Written Representations plus other comments by this date. The 25th October sees the publication of the ExA's further questions (ExQ3) for the Gate Burton Project and the 26th October is the Deadline 1 for the West Burton Project. Therefore, during the whole month of October 2023, deadlines, events, hearings, comments, evidence, information and answers are required by The Planning Inspectorate for the three projects cited. If Interested Parties do not meet these requirements it is reasonable to</p>	<p>(i.e., the commencement of the Examination Stages) would have been held on or around 22 May 2023, 12 April 2023 and 21 June 2023 for Gate Burton, Cottam and West Burton respectively, and so all projects have already experienced significant delay.</p> <p>The dates given in this comment have been superseded by a change in the West Burton timetable owing to a Procedural Decision taken by the Examining Authority in order to balance the resourcing issues identified.</p> <p>Deadline 1A has since been inserted into the examination timetable, which addresses the submission of written representations.</p>



Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>suggest we are not representing ourselves and our views as we would wish to do so and yet to be able to meet all these requirements is impossible for many people.</p> <p>Fourthly, the end of November also sees the three projects coming together. On the 20th November responses are required to the ExA's further written questions (ExQ3, if required) plus other comments for the Gate Burton Project. On the 21st November, Deadline 2 occurs for the Cottam Solar Project, with requirements for comments, responses to ExA first questions plus other information and on the 30th November, Deadline 2 occurs for the West Burton Project. (Also, it is a possibility that the Tillbridge Solar Project will also come on stream at about this same time. If so, this will add further complications and great difficulty for Interested Parties to respond).</p> <p>Fifthly, the next day, on the 1st December, the ExA for the Gate Burton Project will provide commentary on and schedule of changes to the draft DCO (if required). This is a further item for our members to take on board and prepare responses. On the 4th December several days of Hearings commence for the Cottam Solar Project, potentially finishing on the 7th December. During this week on the 5th December the ExA for the West Burton Project will publish the itinerary for the Accompanied Site Visits (if required). The next week commencing the 11th December, Issue Specific Hearings, Open Floor Hearings and Compulsory Acquisition Hearings and Accompanied Site Visits will occur for the West Burton Project. This timetabling means these two projects run across one another and directly before and after one another. This is not manageable for Interested Parties. The 19th December sees the occurrence of Deadline 3 for the Cottam Solar Project, with further comments, summaries and information required by this date. Therefore, three of the four weeks of December</p>	

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>2023 are timetabled by The Planning Inspectorate for the three projects. As yet this does not include any details of the Tillbridge Project which may also occur during this time.</p> <p>Sixthly, directly after the Christmas break on the 4th January 2024, two deadlines share the same date. The Gate Burton Project, has Deadline 7 listed on this day and the West Burton Project, has Deadline 3 timetabled on the same day. In reality, this means Interested Parties will need to work on their submissions for these projects over the Christmas break, following continuous months of endless deadlines and events. There are a further two deadlines in January 2024. Deadline 4 for the West Burton Project on the 18th January and Deadline 4 for the Cottam Solar Project on the 30th January. With ExA's second written questions for the Cottam Solar Project on the 16th January and the ExA's second written questions for the West Burton Project on the 23rd January.</p> <p>Seventhly, there are two Deadlines (5) within one week of each other, namely the 22nd February for the West Burton Project and the 27th February for the Cottam Solar Project. Again, there are requirements for comments and information for both projects. The following week sees a further two Deadlines (6) during the same week (5 th March for the Cottam Solar Project and the 7th March for the West Burton Solar Project). These deadlines require the summary statements from parties plus comments and other information. The close of these two Examinations occurs on these two dates respectively.</p> <p>All the above examples clearly show the different Examinations do not provide adequate time between deadlines for Residents and Interested Parties to give an evidenced response.</p>	

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>ExA's state that the written processes will be the principle means used by the ExA to gather information, evidence, and views about the application. It is therefore imperative that reasonable time is available to meet these requirements.</p> <p>From our perspective, with the unreasonably close, overlapping and clashing timetables for these projects, our members can only draw the conclusion that in reality they are excluded from the processes. If it becomes so impossible for Interested Parties to meet these deadlines, then in effect that is exactly what is happening.</p> <p>An item which has not been included in this appraisal of the timetables for these projects is the Written Representations for the West Burton Project. This submission of information has not been itemised in Annex E of the West Burton Project, Planning Inspectorate's Rule 6 letter dated the 10th August 2023. This means that further submissions are required by Interested Parties which have not been cited and so once this item is included in the ExA timetable for the West Burton Project further potential clashes with other events may accrue.</p> <p>For Interested Parties and residents to be part of these Examinations, it is necessary for the draft timelines to be amended to give more time between deadlines and requirements to assist IP's in making their submissions. We have heard many residents say that 'it's all a done deal'. We believe the overlapping, clashes and little time between these draft Examination timetables only corroborates this viewpoint.</p> <p>Lastly, most residents do not have the experience or expertise in these types of projects. The process, terminology and timetable are tailored for professionals within this line of work or realm of understanding. Residents and the general public need more time to understand and discuss the</p>	

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			requirements with other interested parties so that they can then make their personal submissions.	
7A-05	Examination Process	Venue	<p>"Agenda item 6 Any other matters</p> <p>The Lincolnshire Showground has been specified for the venue for this initial event. Whilst we appreciate a local venue being allocated, the details are vague. There are several conference facilities at the Showground, so more details will be required.</p> <p>Please also note that traffic volume going to and from the Lincolnshire Showground and conference centres may be an issue via the main entrance off the A15 (Ermine Street) throughout October, November, December 2023 and February 2024. Please see the calendar of events for specific details.</p> <p>Also, in recent weeks it has become evident that The Planning Inspectorate is going through a process of structural and procedural change with the move from 'Project Speed' to the introduction of the 'Early Adopters Programme' and staff reassignments and movements from one project to another. These structural changes are very difficult for Interested Parties to grasp along with the major implications and impacts of the proposed projects for the West Lindsey District.</p> <p>Interested parties need to feel reassured that these new procedures and changes within The Planning Inspectorate coupled with the growing number and influx of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project's, will not detrimentally affect the Inspectorate's ability to examine and make recommendations for the current schemes to the Secretary of State."</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.

**7000 Acres [PDB-001]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
7A-06	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>It is sincerely appreciated by members of our group that the Examining Authority postponed the Preliminary on 7th September to prevent 'creating challenges for those seeking to participate in these separate Examinations.'</p> <p>The revised draft Examination Timetable as set out in the rule 6 letter, dated 11th October, does not allay our concerns, in that there are multiple clashes with existing timetables for the Gate Burton and Cottam Examinations as before. These clashes in the timetable are not manageable for Interested Parties.</p> <p>All the above examples clearly show the different Examination timetables (draft and finalised) do not provide adequate time between deadlines for Residents and Interested Parties.</p> <p>Examining Authorities state that the written processes will be the principle means used by the ExA's to gather information, evidence, and views about an application. It is therefore imperative that reasonable time is available to meet these requirements. o From our perspective, with the unreasonably close, overlapping and clashing timetables for these projects, our members can only draw the conclusion that in reality they are excluded from the processes. If it becomes so impossible for Interested Parties to meet these deadlines, then in effect that is exactly what is happening.</p> <p>These clashes prevent Interested Parties from being able to submit informed, reasoned responses to the Examining Authority for the West Burton Project Examination and as such the ExA's recommendations to the Secretary of State will be compromised in this regard. It can also be</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>argued, that this lack of accommodation of the draft Examination Timetable to meet Interested Parties needs to represent their views in full, is in itself discriminatory.</p> <p>For Interested Parties and residents to truly become part of this process and Examinations, it is necessary for the draft timelines to be amended to give more time between deadlines and requirements to assist IP's in making their full and honest submissions. We have heard many residents say that 'it's all a done deal'. We believe the overlapping, clashes and little time between these draft Examination timetables only corroborates this viewpoint. o It must also be considered that most residents do not have the experience or expertise in these types of projects. The process, terminology and timetable are tailored for professionals within this line of work or realm of understanding. Residents and the general public need more time to understand and discuss the requirements with other interested parties so that they can then make their personal submissions.</p> <p>Lastly, the Tillbridge Solar Project is expected to be submitted in the winter of 2023. As this project has been accepted onto the Early Adaptors Programme it is credible that this Examination will gather pace and potentially clash with the West Burton Project Examination as well as the Cottam Solar Project Examination.</p>	
7A-07	Examination Process	Hearings and Examination Procedure	<p>Agenda Item 3</p> <p>The Examining Authority needs to be aware that for many residents, the current venue in Lincoln for the Preliminary Meeting, the Open Floor Meeting and the Issue Specific Hearing presents barriers for many Interested Parties to attend. Due to the demographics of the area, certain</p>	The Applicant notes this comment

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>groups of residents will find it very difficult to be at the Meeting and Hearings.</p> <p>In addition to the above, Lincoln is the City to the region and as such has a very different character and identity to the rural district of West Lindsey. The current venue is not in the area of the effected District and farmland. Therefore, it is not representative of the area and its people.</p> <p>The Examining Authority needs to be aware that for many residents and Interested Parties it is very difficult to participate in events held during the working week and during working hours. Also, many people in the region are not able to utilise the videoconferencing facility provided. Broadband coverage is often slow and irregular in this rural area.</p>	

**Applicant's Response to Adam Sissons [PDA-003]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
AS-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable  Separate Examination Process	<p>"I wish to make a complaint regarding the recent notification I received about the examination commencement date of 7th September for West Burton Solar Project. This immediately follows the start date for Cottam Solar Project which is the 5/6th September. The inspectorate had previously said that the 4 huge solar projects in my area would be examined separately.</p> <p>There is an unrealistic time scale of deadlines which will be required to be met for both projects. The whole situation is becoming extremely confusing for people like myself who wish to have an input. How can the inspectorate compile all the data and submissions for both projects and review effectively? If these projects are being examined at the same time, why can't they be examined as one proposal as they are both being put forward by the same developer, Island Green Power. This just seems to me to be misdirection, bombarding us with emails and letters and dates but making it easier for the developer and their team."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>As noted within the <b>Rule 6 letter [PD-005]</b> Annex E, the Applicant is to produce a "Report on the interrelationship with other National Infrastructure projects" for Deadlines 1-3 and 5. This report will enable the Examining Authority, as well as those interested parties, to better understand the interrelationships between NSIPs. For Deadline 1, the <b>Report on the Interrelationship with other NSIPs [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.9_A]</b> has been published.</p>



**Applicant's Response to Adam Sissons [PDB-002]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
AS-02	Examination Process	Hearings and Examination Procedure	The date and time of the hearing means I will not be able to attend as I will be at work. Why can this not be done in the evening when more people will be able to go? The location also doesn't seem like a relevant place to hold this meeting as it is away from the area in question. Surely it would be better to hold the meeting in one of the local villages which will be affected by the proposal. Having it at a hotel in the city centre means people will have to pay for parking and contend with the traffic to get there. I think this will be off putting even for the few people who may be available at this time of day.	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to Adrienne Longmore [PDA-004]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
ALo-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	"This is to register my objection to the processing of WEST BURTON SOLAR PROJECT AT THE SAME TIME as the COTTAM SOLAR PROJECT. Previously the inspectorate informed interested parties this would NOT be the case. There will be too much information to allow proper analysis of either and this is to me, a form of railroading."	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to Alison Wood [PDA-005]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
AW-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"To whom it may concern</p> <p>As a local resident, I wish to express concern about the timescales imposed by the Inspectorate for public consideration of these schemes. These two programmes appear to be running concurrently despite assurances given that they wouldn't be. Consequently, there isn't enough time to assess each scheme adequately, make submissions and attend meetings. This leads to confusion and make it less likely that proper public consultation can take place. This could lead to an unfair advantage for Island Green Power. These schemes should have a proper interval of several months between them to give interested parties the opportunity to engage properly in the process. Also, if they are both ready to be examined, why not examine them as one? This does not inspire confidence that public participation is a priority for the Inspectorate."</p>	The Applicant refers to the response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to Andrew Ayres [PDA-006]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
AA-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	"Hi I am concerned that the sheer number and complexity of the numerous solar projects in this area of Lincolnshire is overwhelming. As there are being seen as separate, many people see this as just a few solar panels in a field but at the weekend as I was driving around I realised how many of the fields within the boundaries of A156 / A1500 / B1398 / A631 square are going to be used for solar panels. It is easy to identify them due to the archaeological trenches which have been dug, peered into and then covered over. Unfortunately, the pressure group opposed to these projects do not have the time and resources to create smart graphics to show what the overall land usage will be. The developers seems to have unlimited budgets to send our project packs etc telling us not to worry."	The Applicant notes this comment and refers to its response to AS-01 above.  In respect of the comments relating to cumulative landscape and visual effects, the Applicant refers the respondent to its responses at reference 'LAN-01' to 'LAN-05' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b> .
AA-02	Battery Energy Storage Systems	Danger of BESS	"I have seen some mention of the dangers of Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) but this hardly seems to be mentioned in the developer handouts My own view is getting to the stage of it being pointless to comment / attend meetings / opposed the development as it is going to happen irrespective of the pro's and con's."	The Applicant respectfully disagrees and refers the Party to <b>6.2.17 Environmental Statement - Chapter 17 Air Quality [APP-055]; 6.2.21 Environmental Statement - Chapter 21 Other Environmental Matters [APP-059] and Appendix 17.4 BESS Fire Technical Note [APP-136]</b> wherein impacts from the BESS are assessed. Furthermore, mitigation measures to limit the impacts and danger associated with the BESS (such as from fires) is set out in <b>7.9 Outline Battery</b>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				<b>Storage Safety Management Plan [APP-318].</b>

**Applicant's Response to Andrew Johnson [PDA-007]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
AJ-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable  Separate Examination Process	"The four solar farm projects that are currently under consideration in Lincolnshire will all have an effect on where I live. By attending hearings and reading materials provided on the inspectorate website and the websites of the abovementioned projects, I have actively participated in keeping myself informed about all of the projects. The scheduling of the Examinations, however, is getting to the point where it is becoming impossible to continue to be a significant part of the process for all of the projects. It is impossible to consider the way these examinations are set up as anything other than treating locals unfairly. Each exam has its own unique setup, including different Examiners, materials, timeframes, etc. How is it possible for those who will be affected every day for at least two generations and perhaps even up to 60 years to participate in this process. After being told that the schedule will be timed appropriately so i can engage and cope. This is now not the case. Nobody cares about or wants to interact with the public, as seen by the recent notification that the preliminary hearing for West Burton would now take place on September 7 after September 5 and 6 Cottam hearings."	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.
AJ-02	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	"It should be mandated that the two developments being examined concurrently by developer Island Green Power be treated as one development, or at least space them out by six months so that people can interact. I currently have 27 deadlines and dates that I must attend to. This does not include Tillbridge, which will soon be operational! I fail to understand why Island Green Power should be permitted to continue with these timelines in their current state and how the inspectorate could conceivably believe that the general public, who will have to live beside these developments, should not be given a fair and reasonable opportunity to participate in this process. To allow Island Green Power to	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>maintain this schedule is completely un reasonable if you wish the public to have a fair chance to engage. Therefore the timeline should be looked at giving much more space between the two or now they are on the same timeline view them as one!"</p>	

**Applicant's Response to Anna Leckley [PDA-008]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
ALe-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"Dear Sirs, Madams, It is with regret I feel compelled to write with my displeasure regarding the current planning timeline of the Cottam Solar Project and the West Burton Solar project. Such projects as these and their impact to the local area, local people, and collective impact on farming yield, particularly when seen in context with the other planned projects require and must have the true opinions from those it will be effecting most. Allowing the public to have time and opportunity it key. The process of having a day and keeping up with one project in addition to normal daily life is a challenge in itself. Not like Island Green Power who is bringing these projects, they have a huge advantage in having paid employees who spend their days following the steps, and for anyone trying to have a fair chance at opposition, we as individuals have to get our heads around it in our own time, without previous experience or expertise. Why would the planning process be made even more complicated to disadvantage the public to make it harder to ensure they get the chance to express their feelings of strong opposition to these projects, at the right time and to the right place."</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.</p> <p>In response to the respondents comments relating to farming yield, the Applicant points the Party to its soils and agriculture response to issue reference 'SOI-01' to 'SOI-05' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b>.</p>
ALe-02	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	<p>"To make it easier, as the impact will be commutative, surely these should be considered together? If they're ready together, surely this makes sense? If they are to be considered separately, they examining period should be reasonably spread, of at least 2-3 months. I have to confess, trying to keep on top of one project is hard enough, this is a HUGE deal for people in this area and for the UK population who are keen to maintain food security. Why make it even harder for us? I do hope the planning inspectorate will consider these sorts of things. I live in hope."</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.</p> <p>In response to the comments on food security, the Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding food security at reference 'SE-05' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant</b></p>



Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				<b>Representations</b> <b>[EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2].</b>

**Applicant's Response to Canal & River Trust [PDA-009]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CRT-01	Development Consent Order	Protective Provisions	"Following the submission of our relevant representation discussions have been ongoing with the applicant regarding the inclusion of Protective Provisions within the draft Development Consent Order (DCO). We anticipate the inclusion of those Protective Provisions, if agreed, within the draft Development Consent Order or, if not agreed, a place holder within the document."	The Applicant confirms that Protective Provisions pursuant to land controlled by the Canal & River Trust has been updated at Part 13 of Schedule 16 to <b>WB3.1_A Draft Development Consent Order_Revision A [EN010132/EX1/WB3.1_A]</b> .
CRT-02	Examination Process	Draft DCO	"We note that the Rule 6 letter does not yet include an Issue Specific Hearing on the draft DCO which we would likely wish to attend if Protective Provisions are not already agreed or there are unresolved issues between the applicant and the Trust."	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to Sturton by Stow Parish Council (Carol Gilbert) [PDA-010]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SSPC-01	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	"Dear Inspector It is with dismay that Sturton by Stow Parish Council write to you following the decision to start the examination hearing on 7th September for the West Burton Solar application by Island Green Power. There have been several calls for both of the Island Green applications to be heard together (Cottam and West Burton), but this has been disregarded and stated that each application is to be heard separately, even though there is actually only one applicant; Island Green Power. We now find ourselves in the unique and unwanted position of trying to negotiate through four separate large scale solar applications. Three of which are now at varying stages of Examination. The fourth, Tillbridge Solar (whose directors are also Low Carbon and therefore connected) whom will be trialling your new NSIP Reform Early Adopter Programme planning infrastructure process."	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.
SSPC-02	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	"Unfortunately, two of these separate processes are happening immediately after each other. West Burton examination hearing commences on 7th September. Immediately prior to this, on 5th and 6th September, the Hearings for Cottam will have taken place. The sheer number of documents for each application is overwhelming; coupled with the fact that we are facing four such applications; To expect individuals (many of whom work and would have to take leave) to be able to attend on all days and switch from one application to another is unreasonable. Indeed, the Inspectorate has appointed different Inspectors for each application due to their complex nature. Each subsequent stage of examination has a small period in which to comment. This means we are commenting on different projects at differing stages in separate but connected locations. This is not a reasonable situation. We would suggest that there is at least a minimum of three months between each individual	The Applicant notes this comment.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			application in order to stop application fatigue and confusion between projects."	

### Applicant's Response to Catrin Fieldson [PDA-011]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CF-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"Dear Sir/Madam I am writing to express my concerns about the bullyish and rather cynical way these proceedings are progressing. The timetable, venues and communications seem to be laced with obstacles designed to distract, delay or even prevent participation of those genuinely concerned. For example. I have never seen an e mail with an "unsubscribe" link offered directly after an introduction to a topic!! Also, the timings of the various invitations to discuss the proposals has made it very difficult for busy working people to participate ie during the working day in places difficult ( or expensive) to attend and confusing information (albeit no doubt totally within the guidance) but in reality, forcing many citizens to simply give up the fight for information and understanding. The process is administratively and beaurocratically a little heavy for many whose lives will be changed in ways yet to be fully understood, and for what?"</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.
CF-02	The Scheme	Alternative Sites Decommissioning Food Security	<p>"Solar energy should have been captured through planning law 10/20 years ago, but wasn't. All rooves and brown field sites should, by now, be harbouring solar panels and every decommissioned power station site converted to solar. Every disused runway in every disused airfield should be gleaming with solar panels. The last thing that should be considered is farmland. This is a cynical buy-in to absentee avaricious landowners who care little for quality of life, natural diversity or a future they wont be around for.</p> <p>Many people, including experts in the field, are not convinced that the creation of solar panels and all the carbon used to create,</p>	Paragraph 7.6.3 of <b>7.11 Statement of Need [APP-320]</b> analyses the potential contribution of "brownfield" solar sites to the national need for solar generation. Brownfield sites, including rooftop and other community energy systems, are likely to grow in the UK and will make a contribution to decarbonisation of the UK energy system. However, Section 7.6 <b>[APP-320]</b> concludes, that on their own, brownfield

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>transport and decommission them can be justified within a genuinely green agenda, and scrutiny of many of these schemes may reveal that they are being proposed to line pockets and appropriate land . It cannot be right that one essential and vital source of energy (growing energy, food energy) is lost to another! Surely green energy is about NEW energy, resourceful energy that sits alongside and encourages natural diversity, not at the expense of even more natural destruction in what is already the most denuded country in Europe!!"</p>	<p>developments are unlikely to be able to meet the national need for solar.</p> <p>Section 3.3 of document <b>7.11 Statement of Need [APP-320]</b>, specifically paragraphs 3.3.5 and 3.3.11, describes the Government's view that large capacities of low-carbon generation will be required to meet increased demand and replace output from retiring (fossil fuel) plants, and that "<i>a secure, reliable, affordable, Net Zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar</i>". This support for large scale solar as part of the 'answer' to net zero and energy security has been repeated in the draft national policy statements EN-1 and EN-3, published in March 2023.</p> <p><b>6.2.7_A Environmental Statement - Chapter 7 Climate Change Revision A [EN01032/EX1/WB6.2.7_A]</b> contains a detailed assessment of carbon emissions during the life of the Scheme there will be a major beneficial effect on climate change,</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>given the Scheme will be generating electricity from a renewable source.</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding food security at reference 'SE-05' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b>.</p> <p>Upon decommissioning, the Scheme will be returned to its previous condition, as detailed in paragraph 2.1.3 of <b>7.2 Outline Decommissioning Statement [APP-310]</b>.</p>

**Applicant's Response to Cheryl Felix [PDA-012]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CFe-01	Examination Process	Separate Examination Process	"We understand that the West Burton and Cottam schemes are being discussed concurrently. It is important that they are examined and debated singly to give us time to gather our oppositions and make representations. This is despite the fact that there is massive opposition to the entire solar farm."	The Applicant notes this comment.



**Applicant's Response to Clare Ella [PDA-013]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CE-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"I live, work, and spend most of my recreation time in locations affected by all four of the solar farm projects currently being proposed in this part of Lincolnshire. As such, I have been playing an active part in keeping myself informed about all of the projects – attending presentations and reading documents on the relevant project websites and the PINS website. However it is getting to the stage that, due to the way in which the Examinations are being timetabled it is becoming impossible to continue to be part of the process for all of the projects in any meaningful way. Just consider the list below of the Deadlines, following receipt of the latest s6 letter re the West Burton project.</p> <p>31/05/23 – Gate Burton (GB) - s6 letter giving 2 weeks' notice to make submissions 14/06/23 – GB - deadline for submissions prior to preliminary meeting (PM) 04/07/23 – GB PM and OFH1 10/07/23 – Cottam (C) - s6 letter giving 6 weeks' notice to make submissions 11/07/23 – Tillbridge (T) - deadline for comments on PEIR 18/07/23 – GB - D1 08/08/23 – GB - D2 10/08/23 – West Burton (WB) - s6 letter giving 2 week's notice to make submissions 22-25/08/23 – GB - week of OFH2 , ISH 2,3,4, ASI 22/08/23 – C - deadline for submissions prior to PM 24/08/23 – WB - deadline for submissions prior to PM 01/09/23 – GB - D3 5-6/09/23 – C - PM/ OFH/ISH 07/09/23 – WB - PM/OFH 03/10/23 – GB - D4 09/10/23 – GB - OFH 17/10/23 – C - D1 26/10/23 – WB - D1 20/11/23 – GB - D5 21/11/23 – C - D2 30/11/23 – WB - D2 04/12/23 – C - week of OFH/ ISH/ ASI 11/12/23 – WB - week of OFH/ISH/ASI 19/12/23 – C - D3 04/01/24 – WB - D3</p> <p>How is someone who works full time supposed to be able to read the dDCO, all its appendices, documents in support, tables etc, and prepare written representations within the relevant deadlines, read the</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>amended/ tracked/ clean versions of documents, read the responses to the Examiner's written questions, read the transcripts of meetings etc for FOUR (because Tillbridge will no doubt join the fray soon) projects, juggling the timetable above?"</p>	
CE-02	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	<p>"Look at the w/c 22nd August – some of us have already moved work commitments to be able to attend the OFH for GB and follow some of the other hearings, but in addition to the C deadline, we found out 2 days ago that the WB submissions on the conduct of the examination and registration for the OFH is 24/08. Just 1 week later it's the GB D3 and then a few days after that the PM/OFH1 for both C and WB will take place. Personally I moved clients to other appointment times in the w/c 4th Sept to be able to attend the C PM and OFH on 5th September – now the WB PM and OFH hearing have been scheduled for another day the same week! The C and WB timetables are SO aligned that there is very little space between their deadlines and their final examination dates are 5th and 7th March 2024 respectively. WHY ARE THEY NOT BEING EXAMINED AS ONE? The legal teams and examiners can obviously concentrate on just the documents, questions, replies, amendments, research etc for ONE project – as their full time job. Local residents have to read far more documents in their 'spare' time try and to remember which facts and issues relate to which project.</p> <p>The way that these examinations are being scheduled – individually, with different Examiners, documents, timetables etc, cannot be seen as anything other than unfairly prejudicial to local residents. How can those who will be affected on a daily basis - for at least 2 generations and potentially up to 70 years - by the construction, operation and decommissioning of solar panels and the related infrastructure / cabling / decimation of the current natural environment, covering 10,000 acres of</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>land within a relatively few miles' radius, realistically make their views heard? The overlapping deadlines, amount of information to read and assimilate, difficulty of finding and navigating the latest version of documents and their attachments etc are all making it increasingly difficult for us, locals, to engage effectively in this process.</p> <p>We are being discriminated against by PINS allowing the applicants to proceed as if they are separate projects, with their individual timetables and separate documentation, cherry picking data, when in fact their geographical proximity, sharing of cable corridors, and 'co-operation' (and with both the Cottam and West Burton projects being promoted by the same company !!) mean that they should be considered as a combined project, together. Any judicial review of the way in which the Inspectorate is choosing to conduct the examination of these projects would surely conclude that it is in breach of the rules of natural justice. How can it be argued that there is no bias and that locals are being allowed a fair hearing?</p> <p>I object strongly to Cottam and West Burton especially being examined as separate projects. The resources of the local people to object to the four projects are being deliberately stretched to the point where most residents are too time-constrained and document weary to put forward their objections, experiences and concerns, so the applicants in each case will be able to say that there was little local opposition. The examiners will not hear of some of the important arguments that should shape their decisions and recommendations as those affected are being disenfranchised. Whilst I realize that the chances of pleas such as mine receiving any consideration are likely non-existent, I will know that at least I tried!"</p>	

**Applicant's Response to Cllr E Bailey [PDA-014]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
CEB-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	"I would like to highlight my concerns on not having adequate time to assess each of these submissions and attend hearings for these projects as they are so close together. It would appear they are running concurrently, and we have previously been assured that these schemes would be examined independently on completely different timelines to enable interested parties to make their way through the vast amount of information,"	The Applicant notes this comment.
CEB-02	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	"I believe this makes the process unnecessarily confusing and prejudice and allows the developer an unfair advantage. The information is difficult enough to get through and understand for the average interested party. A time frame of at least 6 months should be set between schemes making it far more reasonable and fair. Alternatively, why are the 2 schemes not being examined as 1 as they are both ready at the same time? I would ask that you consider these things if you are keen to show that public participation is important to the planning inspectorate."	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

### Applicant's Response to David Beech [PDA-015]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DB-01	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	"I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my concerns regarding the separate planning processes for the two adjacent solar farm projects, Cottam and West Burton and the other 2 also being considered, in our community. I believe it is essential that these projects be considered together rather than independently. The benefits of such a joint consideration are numerous, including the efficient use of resources, better environmental assessment, and a more comprehensive approach to community impact. It is clear that these solar farm projects share geographical proximity, and any decision made regarding one project is likely to impact the other. By evaluating these projects jointly, we can avoid redundant assessments and streamline the planning process, thus saving valuable time and resources for both the developers and the relevant regulatory bodies and members of the local community"	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.
DB-02	Cumulative Development	Cumulative Impact	"Furthermore, a comprehensive evaluation of the environmental impact of these projects, when considered together, would provide a more accurate assessment of potential consequences. The cumulative effects on local wildlife, soil quality, water sources, and other ecological factors should be thoroughly examined. Approaching these projects separately may lead to a fragmented understanding of the potential environmental risks and hamper the effectiveness of mitigation measures. Additionally, considering the community impact of both projects in unison allows for a more holistic assessment of factors such as visual aesthetics, noise levels, traffic patterns, and overall land use. By doing so, we can ensure that the collective benefits to our community are maximized, and any potential challenges are appropriately addressed. I strongly urge you to encourage the relevant authorities to evaluate these adjacent solar farm projects together. This approach aligns with the principles of efficient resource	Cumulative effects assessments have been prepared for the Application within the <b>Environmental Statement [APP-039 to APP-061]</b> .  Cumulative effects assessments for each topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with the NSIPs identified in paragraph 2.5.9 of 6.2.2 Environmental Statement -

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>utilization, comprehensive environmental assessment, and a community focused perspective. It will ultimately result in a more well-informed and balanced decision-making process. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that your commitment to our community's well-being will guide your actions in this important issue."</p>	<p>Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-040]. This assessment is in accordance with Schedule 4 of the The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and Advice Note Seventeen: Cumulative effects assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects published by the Planning Inspectorate. . The mitigation measures set out across the ES therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.</p>

**Applicant's Response to Doreen Albone [PDA-016]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DA-01	Cumulative Development	Examination Timetable	"I have received information that the two schemes are being looked straight after each other. This is not giving enough time for anyone to process and attend each scheme. This is to close together and is giving Green Power a great advantage each development needs several [months] apart so we can process this. It seems the public are not so important to the inspectorate.. we need time to process each scheme."	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to Dorne Johnson [PDA-017]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DJ-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"All four of the solar farm projects that are now being considered in my area of Lincolnshire will have an impact on where I live.. As a result, I have actively participated in keeping myself updated about all of the projects by attending presentations and reading materials posted on the inspectorate website and the websites of the said projects. However, it is reaching to the point where it is becoming impossible to continue to be a meaningful part of the process for all of the projects due to the way the Examinations are being timetabled. How is someone who has other full time commitments supposed to read the DCO's, all of its appendices, supporting documents, tables, etc., and prepare written arguments within the appropriate deadlines, read the amended versions of documents, read the answers to the Examiner's written questions, read the transcripts of meetings, etc. while juggling such a timetable of four developments? It is impossible to look at the manner these exams are being arranged as anything other than unfairly treating locals. Each exam is set separately, with various Examiners, materials, timings, etc. How can those who will be impacted everyday – for at least two generations and possibly up to 60 years possibly engage in this process. I have now found that after being assured the timetable would run on different timetables enabling us to cope that this is not the case. With the recent announcement that the Preliminary Hearing for West Burton will now be on the 7th after the Cottam hearings on 5th and 6th September it is clear that no one cares or wants to engage with the public!! The developments are un precedented in size, scale and the fact that four are in such close proximity and running for examination at the same time is difficult to cope with."</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.



Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DJ-02	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	<p>"The developer Island Green Power running two developments in examination at the same time now should be made to have them viewed as one!! Or at least give 6 months in between them so the public can engage. I can now count 27 deadlines and dates that I personally have to deal with. This is without Tillbridge which is coming online shortly! I cannot see how Island Green Power should be allowed to have these developments running as they are and how the inspectorate can possibly think that the public who will have to live surrounded by these monstrosities should not be allowed fair and reasonable time to engage with this process. At best to allow Island Green Power to continue with this timeline is prejudicial to the public and at worst it is showing favour to Island Green Power. The public are being completely disenfranchised by this whole process. Whilst there are options to view and attend these meetings online it still doesn't take away the length of time taken to view them and participate. I urge the inspectorate to either get Island Green Power viewed as one development or give the public a fair and reasonable time frame to deal with this."</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to Dr JL and Mrs AM Parkin [PDA-018]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JPAP-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>We are really concerned about the amount of time that has been given between the two applications by Island Green Power (5th &amp; 6th September for Cottam and 7th September for West Burton Solar). This gives people very little time to make comments and attend meetings when so much needs to be investigated and discussed after the first application is examined. We don't think that there is sufficient time between the two examinations. A six- or sevenmonth gap between the two hearings would be better so that residents have time to prepare adequately for each one. By having these dates so close together feels as though the inspectorate may not really value the public's participation in these hearings and what we have to say. If these two applications are ready to be examined on dates so close together, then they should be seen as one project, not two and should be considered by the inspector as one large application. It is very confusing trying to work on these two applications at the same time without having the luxury of the huge legal teams that Island Green Power must have access to. This being advantageous to Island Green Power. We would like our worries to be considered and addressed please, because at this stage there appears to be a biased slant towards the applicant, Island Green Power.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

**Applicant's Response to Dr N Peirson [PDA-019]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
NPe-01	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	<p>"Please could you address the following points. I understand that the Cottam and West Burton schemes are to be examined, separately, but concurrently. This is a confusing state of affairs as both affect the local communities and have a cumulative effect. It would be more straight forward to examine them together, or with a suitable gap of a few months to allow assessment of the first decision. They are clearly closely related and so the determination of one will affect the other. The concurrent examination will particularly prejudice objections as there will be a duplication of hearings , making preparation and attendance more difficult. This unfairly favours Island Green Power, who have significant resources at their disposal. It also suggests that public participation is unimportant to the inspectorate."</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.</p>

**Applicant's Response to Drew Mitchell [PDA-020]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DM-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	"I write to submit the concerns I have relative to the procedural timetable as set out in your letter dated 10 August 2023 ref EN010132. There is insufficient time allowed between the dates for Preliminary Meetings, Hearings and other aspects of the Island Green Power West Burton Solar and Cottam Solar Projects, which are running concurrently, to read the documents, understand the complex information and procedures and to meet the deadlines given by the Planning Inspectorate for interested parties to take on board as these examinations are now overlapping."	The Applicant notes this comment.
DM-02	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	<p>Why have these schemes not been examined together as ONE, especially as West Burton and Cottam are running concurrently and both were submitted by the same company, Island Green Power?</p> <p>I may be mistaken but I understood from information provided by the Planning Inspectorate that the examination timetables for these 4 NSIP applications within a few miles of each other and surrounding 30 communities in the West Lindsey District Council area would be prepared so as not to cause overlapping specifically to allow interested parties to engage fully with the process. As this has not happened here I can see that Island Green Power is receiving an unfair advantage in respect of West Burton Solar and Cottam Solar – the consequence of this is that interested parties and the 30 affected communities are being woefully disadvantaged.</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.
DM-03	Examination Process	Community Engagement	Most people are not familiar with this type of examination procedure and the tight time frames specified in the examination timetables are not conducive to people being able to understand and familiarise themselves and act on the matters at each stage in the process. I am aware the outcome of these tight timescales have triggered some interested parties	The Applicant notes this comment.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
		Cumulative Development	<p>to feel overwhelmed, disadvantaged and excluded and question whether they should continue to take part in the examination process, including myself. Furthermore, the Gate Burton Solar application is presently with the Examining Authority (and shortly to follow Tillbridge Solar), 4 enormous NSIP projects on 10,000 acres of farmland, within a very few miles of each other. Each scheme has meant the people affected by them have had to engage with the examination process individually for each one, a massive undertaking which can cause an individual to lose track of where they are in the process. This would not have happened had all four schemes been considered as ONE. The scale and cumulative effects of these 4 NSIP projects in our small rural area is prejudicial to the area where I live and to the lives of those residents of the 30 affected communities. Excluded, disadvantaged and discriminated from fully participating in the process at the September 2023 meetings arranged by the Planning Inspectorate for these projects (7th September West Burton &amp; 5th and 6th September Cottam) that are taking place as yet again (as per the Gate Burton Solar meeting dates in July) are during work days when many people will be unable to attend.</p>	

**Applicant's Response to Drew Mitchell [PDB-004]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
DM-04	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	The Examining Authority's email of 11 October set out the Revised draft Examination Timetable for the above. I would like to bring to the Examining Authority's attention the dates set for the West Burton Hearings and Deadlines are still running similarly close to those of the other NSIPs currently in examination particularly for Cottam Solar where there are a number of hearings taking place over the period 5th to 9th December. The draft Examination Timetables for the NSIPs currently under examination, ie Cottam, West Burton and Gate Burton, also include a series of numbered Deadlines for receipt of written submissions. It concerns me as I feel I and other interested parties will not have time to adequately assess each scheme and make submissions, attend hearings and participate in the process. A longer period of time needs to be provided between each NSIPs examination timetable to help residents prepare and become involved.	The Applicant notes this comment.
DM-05	Examination Process	Location of Hearings	The Lincoln City Centre venue makes for getting to West Burton hearings very difficult as excessive and costly car parking charges will prevent me from attending and no doubt others who would have done had the meeting location had free parking. Lincoln is also further away from the areas affected by these solar schemes and it would help if such meetings could be held closer to where the affected residents live.	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to Elaine Stiles [PDA-021]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
ES-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable  Cumulative Development	<p>"It is with much disquiet that I have learned the two enquiries, as above, are to run concurrently. I believe that the 4 local solar projects are exploiting a loop hole in the law and the regulations by which you must work, to circumvent a proper consideration by yourself of the impact of the one massive project. Having to accept that this is the case, I had understood that the four projects would be examined in due time, separately, in order to give we villagers who are effected by the development a proper chance to engage in each process. For those of us who have never been involved in planning decisions this is a remarkably complicated process and trying to keep up with two which are to run concurrently is at best extremely unfair. Please would you reconsider the timings of each enquiry and also consider all three as a whole in order to give us time to understand the process."</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to Eleanor Broadbent [PDA-022]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
EBr-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable Cumulative Development	<p>"To whom it may concern, Pushing through the examination of both projects separately but so close together (Just one or two days apart) is not in line with what we were initially informed of, that the two would be examined on completely separate timelines. A gap of even a month or two (though more would be preferable) would allow for individuals and groups to have time to put forward their concerns. By having both so close together it robs the public of extra, vital, time to respond and divides people between the two projects. Allowing either for the developments to be examined as one, or if not, a reasonable time apart, would bring some level of relief during a stressful time for many. If this is at all possible, you would have the gratitude of a good number of local people whose lives are going to be greatly impacted if these projects go forward as planned."</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.



**Applicant's Response to Emma Bailey [PDA-023 and PDB-003]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
EBa-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable  Cumulative Development	<p>"I would like to highlight my concerns on not having adequate time to assess each of these submissions and attend hearings for these projects as they are so close together. It would appear they are running concurrently, and we have previously been assured that these schemes would be examined independently on completely different timelines to enable interested parties to make their way through the vast amount of information,</p> <p>I believe this makes the process unnecessarily confusing and prejudice and allows the developer an unfair advantage. The information is difficult enough to get through and understand for the average interested party. A time frame of at least 6 months should be set between schemes making it far more reasonable and fair. Alternatively, why are the 2 schemes not being examined as 1 as they are both ready at the same time?</p> <p>I would ask that you consider these things if you are keen to show that public participation is important to the planning inspectorate"</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.
EBa-02	Soils and Agriculture	Loss of Agricultural Land  Food Security	<p>The site is planned to be the largest in the UK, affecting approx. 10000 acres of open rural landscape. That the majority of is used to grow food.</p> <p>According to DEFRA, all the land affected is good quality agricultural land, the majority being Grade 3a. With quality agricultural land such as this swiftly decreasing and with this</p>	The Applicant points the Party to its soils and agriculture response to issue reference 'SOI-01' to 'SOI-05' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b> .

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>site potentially being the largest in the UK, we object to such a large agricultural area being transformed in one location.</p> <p>Food security must be a priority for the UK. The carbon footprint on importing 40 % of the countries food is notable and the majority of crops grown within these areas a re essential to the bio diversity of the area and the reduction of CO2.</p> <p>A development of this size, (combined) contradicts various environmental and food security papers and reports. Ignoring the recommendations from experts in their field.</p> <p>In 2021 there was 250,000 hectares of south facing commercial roof space = 50% of UKs electricity. 17 million homes in the UK only 6% have PV's and there are 7 million hectares of brownfield sites or grade 4 &amp; 5 land all better for solar placement.</p>	<p>In respect of the comments made relating to site selection, the Applicant directs the respondent to its responses to issues referenced ALT-02 and PRI-08 within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b>.</p>
EBa-03	The Scheme	Lack of Detail	<p>"The substation sites have not been made clear in relation to size, staffing and contingency should any thing go wrong."</p>	<p>The size of each of the substations is described in paragraph 4.5.35 of <b>6.2.4 Environmental Statement - Chapter 4 Scheme Description [APP-042]</b> and indicative substation design drawings are provided at <b>6.3.4.1 Environmental Statement - Appendix 4.1 Engineering Drawings and Sections [APP-070]</b>.</p> <p>Safety and mitigation measures in relation to the substations is included in <b>7.14_A Outline Operational Environmental</b></p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				<p><b>Management Plan Revision A [EN010132/EX1/WB7.14_A]</b> (OEMP) which is secured by Requirement 14 of Schedule 2 to <b>WB3.1_A Draft Development Consent Order Revision A [EN010132/EX1/WB3.1_A]</b>. Any personnel working on the operation of the Scheme will be required to adhere to the provisions in the OEMP.</p>
EBa-04	Batteries	Battery Safety	<p>"Lithium-ion batteries are a very new, 'untested and potentially very hazardous technology'. There have been fires and explosions all over the world caused by Lithium-ion batteries. Our small local fire service will not have the facilities to deal with fires of this kind on this scale.</p> <p>The batteries will not be able to store the required amount of electricity that will impact the usage over the winter months when demand is at its highest. With this in mind, the environmental effects of mining the ingredients for these batteries is detrimental to climate change and does not outweigh the need for solar energy."</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to the response to AA-02 above. Furthermore, the Applicant is in continued discussions with Lincolnshire Fire Service as part of Lincolnshire County Council, with these matters discussed through <b>WB8.3.1 Lincolnshire County Council Statement of Common Ground [EN010132/EX1/WB8.3.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant also refers the Party to response 'AIR-01' with regard to air quality, '7A-29' with regard to supply during winter, within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b>.</p> <p>With relation to the carbon cost of the construction of the Scheme against the benefits to carbon reduction over its</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				operational lifetime, the Applicant also refers the party to response 'DC-02' within <b>WB8.1.5 Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submissions at the Open Floor Hearing (OFH1) [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.5]</b> .
EBa-05	The Scheme	Construction Period	"How long do the developers estimate the construction period in total to last?, this includes preparing the site for development and the building the scheme itself. During this time how many additional HGV vehicles per day are expected, along with light goods vehicles, using new and existing networks of local lanes, some of which are not fit for HGV's, between 7am-7pm Monday-Saturday?"	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding construction timescale at reference 'PRI-05', and to construction traffic and transport issues at reference 'TRA-01' to 'TRA-05' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b> .
EBa-06	Landscape	Adverse Landscape Impacts	The scheme will result in significant adverse landscape effects."	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding landscape at reference 'LAN-01' to 'LAN-05' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b> .
EBa-07	Biodiversity	Impact on Biodiversity	Off shore wind turbine is a much more "proven" way of efficiently producing electricity for the UK. Evidence of solar farms impact on biodiversity remains limited and is only 11-15% efficient.  Solar farms make it impossible for local authorities to commit to a viable local nature recovery strategy which	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding efficiency or alternative energy sources at reference 'ALT-02', and to ecology and biodiversity issues at reference 'ECO-01' to 'ECO-04' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's</b>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			aims to do the complete opposite to what would happen in the areas making unstable eco systems.	<b>Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2].</b>
EBa-08	Socio-Economic	Lack of Jobs	Solar farms will not continue to provide the same amount of jobs these farming areas do currently. They will not create an economic benefit to the already hard-pressed communities affected.	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding employment at reference 'STR-03' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2].</b>
EBa-09	Health and Well-being	Impact on Residents	Health and wellbeing of residents is a priority for our Local Authority, the landscape, noise, increase in traffic, bridle and footpath disruption will have an adverse effect not to mention the negative impact on birds, insects, bats and agricultural diversity.	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding health and wellbeing and noise at references 'OEM-01', 'OEM-02' and 'OEM-04' and reference 'LAN-01' to 'LAN-05' and 'TRA-01' to 'TRA-05' for landscape, traffic and public rights of way as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2].</b>
EBa-10	Electromagnetic Sensitivity	Lack of Research	Further research into electromagnetic sensitivity is required before large scale plans are agreed.	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding electromagnetic sensitivity at reference 'SE-02' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2].</b>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
EBa-11	The Scheme	Land Use Other Developments	<p>This is a knee jerk reaction that has not been thought out properly in the absence of a National land use strategy.</p> <p>Lincolnshire appears to be the governments answer to all problems at the moment, Migrants at Scampton, Large scale Solar energy, everywhere and potentially a mineral mine in Lea. In the future a fusion plant will also play apart in the areas development but residents are concerned of the impact on the rural areas we call homes. I would like to state that I am not apposed to solar energy but I am for this area using land that could otherwise produce food</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding energy need and food security at reference 'ENE-01' and 'ENE-02', and ALT-02 and PRI-08 regarding site selection, as contained within <b>WB8.1.2</b></p> <p><b>The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations</b> <b>[EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2].</b></p>

**Applicant's Response to Frank Powell [PDA-024]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
FP-01	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	"As a resident in the immediate area where the proposal to erect 4 Solar Farms of enormous capacity and size in the Lincolnshire countryside I find it totally unacceptable that the Inspectorate is going to examine each application for a solar farms individually. In view of the impact these large and unacceptable solar farms are going to have , firstly on the production of vital food supplies from the land and the enormous upheaval to the country side where they are planned it is imperative that the full combined impact of these solar farms be examined as a whole."	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.
FP-02	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	"In addition you should note the following points: 1. I suspect that the inspectorate will not devote adequate time to examine each and every application separately. I would be much easier to examine them as a whole and assess the overall impact on the area; 2. I suspect that you will be unnecessarily confused and prejudice by this action; 3. Will other applications (e.g. Island Green Power) gain an unfair advantage by your proposed actions; 4. If each application is to be examined individually you need to plan a much larger gap of weeks not days between each examination to allow the public to make the necessary arrangement to attend the meetings. 5. If the above is acted upon it would send a message to the public that the inspectorate understand and acknowledge the vital public input to the examination of these applications."	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to Gaynor Collins [PDA-025]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
GC-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable Cumulative Development	<p>"I understand that the examination for West Burton Solar is starting on 7th September which will follow the examination start of the Cottam Solar Project on 5th and 6th September. The inspectorate had previously stated that the schemes could not be examined together and that the schemes would be examined independently on completely different timelines to enable interested parties to manage the vast amounts of information and make submissions. Having both of these examinations virtually together makes it very difficult to process these vast amounts of information and comment on them or to attend hearings if they are close together. Would it not be better to either examine them together or give a reasonable amount of time in between each examination – six months or a year maybe? It would seem that the inspectorate are not interested in what the public have to say on these matters and feel it is unimportant for us to be included. Surely, given the number of these projects which are springing up in our local area, it would only seem fair for us to be able to be able to look at all the information and comment on it. It appears that the companies leading these projects are almost working as one to overcome what the local communities think and feel about these monstrosities they wish to erect in our beautiful countryside. It feels very much like these projects are already a done deal with little/no regard for what the local people think. I look forward to your comments."</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.



**Applicant's Response to Geoffrey Turner [PDA-026]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
GT-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"I am writing on behalf of Brampton Meeting, at reading of The Planning Inspectorate's intention to start the examination of the West Burton Solar Project on the 7th September, immediately following the examination start of the Cottam Solar Project on the 5th and 6th September. We had been advised by The Planning Inspectorate that the examinations for the four NSIP's in the West Lindsey District would be separated in timetabling to allow interested parties to manage the large amount of information, make the many submissions, meet deadlines, attend hearings and attempt to understand the implications of these proposed schemes for themselves and their communities. This is unreasonable - or, more cynically, perhaps it is a strategy to make engagement more difficult! The recent publishing of the 7th September for the Preliminary Meeting for the West Burton Solar Project, along with Cottam Solar Project examination beginning the same week, are not acceptable for our village or for other parties affected by the four NSIP's in the West Lindsey District. We urge the Planning Inspectorate to re-assess the timings of these meetings and take into account our needs. To not do so, seems prejudicial and will lead to interested parties being displaced and removed from the process. The inspectorate seem to miss the point that this consultation exercise is alienating ordinary people who will be personally affected by these proposals. In addition, this arrangement of dates also seems contradictory on The Planning Inspectorate's behalf in that, it has stated that the four projects, Gate Burton, Cottam Solar, West Burton Solar and Tillbridge Solar, were to be examined independently and that logistics of arranging them collectively would not be possible. This new development of published dates for the West Burton and Cottam Solar Project's,</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			undermines The Planning Inspectorate's position in this regard. I await your response and will communicate that to our village."	

**Applicant's Response to Gillian Stonham [PDA-027]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
GS-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable Cumulative Development	<p>"Thank you for my recent emails which gave me cause for concern.... My understanding was that the Inspectorate had previously said that the schemes could not be examined together, and that the schemes would be examined independently on completely different timelines to enable interested parties to understand the vast amounts of data and to make appropriate submissions. It looks as though the two schemes, West Burton and Cottam are running concurrently on 5th, 6th and 7th of September. If both schemes are ready why can't they be examined as a single entity?...or is it simply that the Planning Inspectorate are aiming at public exclusion whilst giving the schemes an unfair advantage by creating confusion and prejudice? If public participation is to be encouraged, and each development is to be considered separately then a gap of at least three months between hearings might allow the public to participate in a more informed way. I hope you are able to take my comments into consideration."</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to Helen Mitchell [PDA-028, PDA-029 and PDB-005]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
HM-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable  Cumulative Development	<p>"On Thursday 10th August I received an email from NI Mail Distribution twice, both identical copies, regarding the West Burton Solar Project Planning Act 2008 - Section 88 and 89 and The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 - Rules 4,6, 9 and 13, informing me that the examination for West Burton Solar is starting on 7th September, immediately following the examination start date of the Cottam Solar Project on 5th and 6th September. I was of the understanding that the Inspectorate had previously stated that the 4 schemes in my area (Gate Burton, West Burton, Cottam and Tillbridge) totalling 10,000 acres, all proposed within a few miles of one another, could not be examined together and that the schemes would be examined independently on completely different timelines to enable interested parties to manage and read the vast amount of information and be able to make submissions accordingly. I am completely overwhelmed by the number of deadlines, documents, meetings and updates for these projects, which are incredibly difficult to keep track of as the dates are all running concurrently. I feel confused about what is happening when, and it is almost a full time job trying to keep abreast of when submissions need to be made and for which project. Yet again this latest meeting on the 7th September is a Thursday morning when many people are likely to be at work. I feel this whole process gives an unfair advantage to Green Island Power, the developer of both West Burton and Cottam, as interested parties like myself only have limited time in which to compose detailed responses to multiple projects. If these projects are to be examined at the same time why can't they be examined together as one project? I feel as if this is being made as difficult as possible for the public who wish to object or have an input on these projects."</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
HM-02	Examination Process	Cumulative Development	<p>"Why have two of the schemes been proposed by the same developer, Island Green Power? West Burton and Cottam. Should these not be considered one huge proposal? It is like they are trying to slip one through the net. The above aspects are confusing in their own right, but it is made worse by one of the four projects being named West Burton Solar Project and another developer branding their proposal as Gate Burton Energy Park. This confusion could prevent any opposition and cause the general public to lose track of where each one is in the process."</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.</p>

**Applicant's Response to Historic England [PDA-030]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
HE-01	Historic Environment	Consistency	"INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF PRINCIPAL ISSUES – consistency between West Burton and Cottam Solar Schemes. Please could we request that 'The medieval bishop's palace and deer park, Stow Park' is specifically mentioned in West Burton Solar's INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF PRINCIPAL ISSUES, - see Annex D 6.1 to mirror the specific mention of Thorpe Medieval Settlement in Annex D 9 a) of the rule 6 letter for Cottam Solar – see below. In both cases the named monuments have been identified by Historic England (in our relevant representations) as matter of particular concern regarding avoidable harm to the significance of designated heritage assets."	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to Jeff Summers [PDA-031]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JSu-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"Dear sir or madam. How would you the examining body feel if you had a second job which takes up 8 to 10 hours per day before you are able to examine this application. An eighteen hour day you could not manage. You are working as a team of how many ? standing alone and responding to two PINS applications at the same time is grossly unfare. You are deliberately putting all those with an interest at a significant disadvantage. As a working man I am not blessed with an endless pot of money to afford the expertise that both you and the applicant are privy to . You are using establishment funding."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

**Applicant's Response to Jill Cowan [PDA-032]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JCn-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	"Dear Sir, I refer to your letter regarding Rule 6, that you are about to commence the examination of the West Burton and Cottam Solar Projects. You previously stated that the schemes could NOT be examined together and would be done independently of each other on different time lines, thus enabling interested parties to manage the huge amounts of information and make submissions. And yet here we are a short while later about to run the two projects concurrently. How can this be?. Do you really think you are allowing adequate time to assess each scheme as well as making submissions and attending hearings? Are you confusing the 2 projects and being prejudiced by this, therefore allowing Island Green Power an unfair advantage? Surely each project should be considered separately with a reasonable period of time in between for all the above reasons. Is public participation unimportant to the inspectorate as its already a 'done deal' and this is going through the motions."	The Applicant notes this comment.
JCn-02	The Scheme	Cumulative Development Ecological Impact Loss of agricultural land Loss of jobs	"I really think that alot more consideration is given to all of these prospective solar farms. They would be taking not only the beauty of the countryside and the habitats of the wildlife that live here, but ruining valuable growing land for decades to come, let alone taking away many jobs from the countryside. Also making a few unscrupulous men rich before they move on to the next area and see what devastation they can cause. I urge you to give deep consideration to the damage that will be done to this	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues biodiversity, agricultural land and employment at references ECO-02, SOI-01 and PRI-08 as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b> .



Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>area and surrounding ones when we are covered in cheap Chinese solar panels. What's happened to carbon reduction."</p>	<p>In response to comments relating to landscape the Applicant refers the Party to responses 'LAN-01' to 'LAN-05' in the same document.</p> <p><b>6.2.7_A Environmental Statement - Chapter 7 Climate Change Revision A [EN01032/EX1/WB6.2.7_A]</b> contains a detailed assessment of carbon emissions during the life of the Scheme there will be a major beneficial effect on climate change, given the Scheme will be generating electricity from a renewable source.</p>

**Applicant's Response to John Perkins [PDA-033]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JPe-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable Cumulative Development	"I am very unhappy to find that the examination for West Burton Solar is starting on 7th September, immediately following the examination start of the Cottam Solar Project on the 5th and 6th September. This does not provide enough time to adequately assess each scheme and make my submissions or to attend hearings. I am being unnecessarily confused and prejudiced by this. Is Island Green Power therefore gaining an unfair advantage? It seems so to me to be the case. If each development is to be considered separately surely a much greater period should be allowed between hearings. Alternatively as they are now both ready to be examined why can't they be examined as one?"	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to Jon Scourse [PDA-034]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JSc-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"The situation regarding the consultation process for the various schemes proposed in West Lindsey is weighted heavily in favour of those interested parties seeking Planning Permission. The NSIP timetable for all three schemes demonstrate a highly intensive programme. I have attended one session of the Gate Burton process. This demonstrated that this is clearly a "David and Goliath" process. Those seeking planning permission were supported by a team of no less than seven legal and planning experts, no doubt at great expense in fees. By comparison the legal advisors from West Lindsey DC and Lincolnshire CC were heavily outnumbered. Those likely to be the most adversely affected - the local village residents - were represented by the "7000 Acres" group. These hard pressed volunteers cannot afford to employ professional legal advice and have to give their time freely - indeed, some have even had to cancel their annual leave to attend these meetings. These dedicated people now face a programme that is overwhelming. The NSIP timetable places local people at a significant disadvantage. In addition to the lack of financial and professional resources - and giving their own time - these volunteers have a massive problem. The concurrent nature of the timetable is such that the burden falls on a few people willing and able to step up and argue their case. It is unreasonable to expect such small communities to be able to contribute sufficient volunteers without legal experience on this timescale. The overlap of the consultation across three schemes is significantly weighted to the advantage of the legal and planning experts. My understanding was that these schemes would be examined independently on differing timelines - particularly to enable interested parties to understand the vast amounts of data to make informed submissions. It is relentless for volunteers and there is still the Tillbridge</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>scheme to come. Given the geography of the four schemes, with identical landscape usage in the Trent Valley, it is regrettable that the Planning Inspectorate has chosen to duplicate the process leading to this situation. In effect, the voice of local people is being excluded by default, giving the four schemes a significant advantage by creating confusion. One does wonder if this was always the strategy. I do hope that you can see the situation from the point of view of those most likely to be affected by this massive development and understand that we have a valid point."</p>	

**Applicant's Response to Julian Plews [PDA-035]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
JPI-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable  Cumulative Development	<p>"The application should be examined along with all the others that are being submitted by IGP and all its subsidiaries to cover all projects (i.e. c. 10,000 acres) as they all affect West Lindsey DC and its inhabitants. I believe that the process and the applications are fundamentally flawed because the scale and number of these schemes in a short space of time does not enable people to engage with the process. Furthermore two of the schemes are being proposed by the same developer, Island Green Power, which shows they are joined schemes. If these projects are to be considered individually a greater period of time needs to be provided between each examination to help residents prepare and become involved. The developers have had several years to prepare their submissions (even though late additions are being submitted) whereas we, as individuals, have a few months to object and the sheer volume of documents and the complexity of them make it impossible for us, as laymen, to adequately understand. The above aspects are confusing in their own right, but it is made worse by one of the projects being named West Burton Solar Project and another developer branding their proposal as Gate Burton Energy Park. This use of similar names only adds to the confusion. It is easy to see that with these proposals running at roughly the same time, confusion could prevent opposition and cause the general public to lose track of where each one is in the process. Also, these 4 huge proposals are not the only ones in Lincolnshire (there are at least 9 proposed for this county alone). The difference is that these 4 schemes, are all within a few miles of each other."</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to Kexby Parish Council [PDA-036]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
KePC-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	I am registered as an interested party for the 4 solar farm proposals both for myself and our Parish Council. I would like to register my objection to the inspectorate choosing to run the initial examination phase for 2 of these projects virtually in tandem. In order to be present at these meetings it requires me, like others, to take time off from work, which is a consideration the inspectorate should include in their timetabling as by lumping these meetings one immediately after the other only works to exclude interested parties. I am aware that you have already been advised of the very poorly arranged timetable by the 7000 acres representative group and we would expect some action such as changing the date of the West Burton proposal to occur at least 2-3 weeks after the Cottam project.	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to Lincolnshire County Council [PDA-037]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
LCC-01	Cumulative Development	Landscape and Construction Traffic	"The Council wishes to make submissions in respect of item 3 in particular to request that the Examining Authority considers holding an Issue Sceptic Hearing involving the other 2 projects at examination Cottam and Gate Burton to hear evidence on the cumulative impacts resulting from the 3 applications in respect of landscape and construction traffic."	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.
LCC-02	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	"Item 5 request changes to the information to be submitted at Deadline 1 due to the commencement of Cottam examination the same week and Heckington 2 weeks after West Burton PM requiring the Council to produce 3 LIR for October deadlines as well as working on Gate Burton and Mallard Pass examination deadline requirements' during October as well."	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to Liz Garbutt [PDA-038]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
LG-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	"I was shocked to receive notification from yourselves outlining the start date for Examination of the West Burton Project is the same week as the start for the Cottam Solar Project. This is not acceptable. In the West Lindsey District we are struggling to manage four NSIP projects and then to have The Planning Inspectorate run these two projects together is adding insult to injury. Please can The Planning Inspectorate look again at this timetabling to enable people to stand some chance in representing their views."	The Applicant notes this comment.



**Applicant's Response to Lorraine Hardy [PDA-039]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
LH-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable Cumulative Development	"I feel I have to speak up about how this process is panning out. The whole process is confusing to the general public and I know of many people who are against this proposal but are feeling disempowered as they don't understand the system. Breaking things down into separate parts makes it even more confusing as there is a bombardment of information coming through and crossing over each other. Why can't the projects be examined as one or is there an ulterior motive for confusing the public. If you see our input as being important then the system has to be simplified otherwise we are being put at an unfair disadvantage."	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to M J Dover [PDA-040]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
MD-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable Cumulative Development	<p>"With the announcement that four major NSIP solar projects totalling in excess of 10,000 Acres of mainly high productive arable farming land, people asked that the impact of these four huge projects be considered as one. The developers are working in collaboration and I believe they are all represented by the same legal team too. However the resulting pressure on individual households to I put relevant representations, objections and attend planning inspectorate hearings is unfairly weighted in the favour of the developers. Gate Burton I'd currently being heard, with Cottam and West Burton schemes beginning early next month and within days of each other, with Tillbridge scheme due to be announced soon, It is grossly unfair to to run these scheme hearing almost concurrently, it gives individuals as well as councils no real time to prepare for or being able to attend meetings. Developers however, only need to concentrate on their own scheme. I maintain that the impact of the four schemes should be considered collectively, however as this request was denied, I believe it only fair that each of these mammoth schemes be considered in toto and before considering the next."</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to Mark Prior [PDA-041]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
MP-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable  Cumulative Development	<p>"I am extremely concerned about the timing of the West Burton Solar NSIP hearings and how they coincide with the Cottam Solar NSIP. These are two of four solar NSIPs within three miles of our family home! Both the West Burton and Cottam solar NSIPs have Island Green Power as the Applicant. Local residents have long made the case that they are effectively one application. For example, Cottam One is closer to the West Burton boundary than it is to Cottam Two and Three, so effectively the schemes are intertwined. We were assured by the Planning Inspectorate that they were separate schemes and would be examined in series, with sufficient time for local residents to assess and respond to each scheme in turn. In fact, the Gate Burton, Cottam and West Burton solar NSIPs are being examined concurrently, which places a huge burden on the local population and councils to play their legitimate role in the planning process. Either the two Island Green Power Applications should be examined as one, after all they are only 1,000m apart at their closest point and share features such as cable connectors, or West Burton should be heard after Cottam is concluded. Anything else is swamping the local population, and councils, and plays into the hand of the Applicant as opposition will be muted by the sheer volume of the task. By overwhelming the local population, who have until now had no experience of NSIPs, they are effectively being denied their legitimate voice in these schemes."</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.
MP-02	The Scheme	Impact on Local Environment	<p>"Covering 10,000 acres of farming land with solar panel, batteries and associated infrastructure will have a devastating and generational impact on our local environment, we must not be denied our voice in this process."</p>	The Applicant is confident that the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage is in

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				<p>accordance with the Planning Act 2008 and associated guidance. This has been evidenced in <b>5.1 Consultation Report [APP-022]</b>, which was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and accepted for examination.</p> <p>For example, as described in Chapter 2 <b>[APP-022]</b>, the Applicant undertook three phases of community consultation to share information and invite feedback at different stages of the Scheme.</p>

**Applicant's Response to Mark Prior [PDB-006]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
MP-03	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>Firstly, I appreciate that the ExA suspended the Preliminary Meeting for the West Burton NSIP due to concerns over timetable clashes between this and the other adjacent solar NSIPs in West Lindsay. However, the new timetable re-introduces the same issue. For example, the week commencing 20th November requires local residents to respond to deadlines for the Gate Burton (20th Nov), Cottam (21st Nov) and West Burton (24 Nov) NSIPs. As these schemes are in close proximity, most local residents will wish to respond to all 3 consultations, as well as 2 other NSIPs at the Pre-Application stage, and 1 sub NSIP solar application. As each application makes a slightly different case, and makes different claims over the disputed benefits they will bring, local residents cannot make a generic response to the schemes. I request that the Preliminary Meeting is delayed until the Gate Burton and Cottam NSIPs are completed.</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.
MP-04	Examination Process	Hearing Locations	<p>Secondly, I request that future hearings are held near to the proposed scheme and not in Lincoln. There are suitable venues in and around Gainsborough that could accommodate hearings</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to Mark Wardle [PDA-042 and PDB-007]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
MW-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable  Cumulative Development	"I am writing to you with regards to the aforementioned solar project planning process. I consider there has not been enough time to adequately assess each of Island Green Power,s massive solar developments and have found the whole process extremely difficult to navigate I am aware that a lot of effected residents have been unable to make submissions because of the confusing processes involved, therefore Island Green Power have gained a significant advantage. I also would urge the inspectorate to consider all of Island Green Power's to be considered together as in essence they are closely linked."	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.
MW-02	Loss of Agricultural Land	Food Security	"The reasons I give for not supporting any of these projects is the misuse of viable and active food growing arable land which in todays world of uncertainty should be used to help feed the nation."	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding food security at reference 'SE-05' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b> .  Upon decommissioning, the Scheme will be returned to its previous condition, as detailed in paragraph 2.1.3 of <b>WB7.2 Outline Decommissioning Statement [APP-310]</b> .
MW-03	Biodiversity	Loss of Hedgerows	"The wanton destruction of miles of hedgerows to enable this project to be built which provide irreplaceable habitat and wildlife corridors for the resident wildlife. In this country we take pride in protecting our biodiversity a mega project such as this and the others that are projected	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding hedgerows, ecology and biodiversity issues at reference

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			to be built in very close proximity of this particular project would decimate all manner of flora and fauna resident in this area."	'ECO-01' to 'ECO-04' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b> .
MW-04	Public Health	Concern of living close to solar panels	"The thought of living amidst millions of large solar panels and associated equipment fills me full of fear and dread, the word often used is a "solar desert" devoid of all the benefits of living in a rural location."	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding public health at reference 'OEM-01 as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b> .
MW-05	Energy Storage	Battery Safety	"The safety of the battery storage has been questioned by numerous experts in the field of firefighting. In the event of a fire these would be left to burnout polluting the location with unknown contaminants, with no local water source to enable the firefighters to try and protect the local area this would potentially threaten local communities with uncontrolled wildfires."	The Applicant refers to the response to AA-02 above
MW-06	Site Selection	Use of brownfield and roof tops	"The answer to solar developments is to use brown field locations, warehouse roofs and home solar panel systems."	The Applicant refers to the response to CF-02 above.

**Applicant's Response to Martin Brown [PDA-043]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
MB-01	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	"The four proposed projects in the area should be considered as one project. Two of them are from the same developer, keen to proceed with grid connections secured at Cottam and West Burton Power Stations. The Examination Timetable for these two projects needs to be deconflicted, as it currently lacks separation."	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to Martin Brown [PDB-008]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
MB-01	Examination Process	Hearing Locations	It is regrettable that the resumed hearings are to be held in central Lincoln. The location and timings will make attendance either in person or online difficult for many of those affected	The Applicant notes this comment.



**Applicant's Response to Marton and Gate Burton Parish Council [PDA-044]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
MGBPC-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"Marton and Gate Burton Parish Council finds it unacceptable that both the West Burton and the Cottam Solar Project examinations appear to be running concurrently. We are a small parish council, operating on a volunteer basis with some of our members also working in full time employment. The timing of these examinations make it very difficult to make representations to these hearings considering the multiple applications being made in this area, all of which are being brought forward as single issues. If these proposed developments are to be considered separately, may we suggest a time gap of 6 months. After all, if they are available to be examined now, why can they not be included as one?"</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

**Applicant's Response to Mick Chamberlain [PDA-045]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
MC-01	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	"I believe, that the reason these are being held separately is because , it the appears to bit a little and it will not harm anybody , if it was judged as one big lump , I am sure it would be thrown out , if you look at the total amount of solar in Lincolnshire , it is massive , The wool appears to be being pulled over the county's eyes."	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to Patricia A Mitchell [PDA-046] & [PDA-048]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
PM-01 [PDA-046]	Examination Process	Examination Timetable  Cumulative Development	<p>"On Thursday, 10 August, 2023 I received, from the Planning Inspectorate an identical email 4 times timed at 13.08 into my Inbox 'Planning Act 2008 – Section 88 and 89 and The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – Rules 4, 6, 9 and 13' which preceded an email also into my Inbox timed at 13.16 both in respect of EN010132: West Burton Solar Project Updates – stating 'The notification of the Preliminary Meeting (rule 6 letter) has been published' alerting me (and other Interested Parties (IPs) ) that the examination for West Burton Solar is starting on 7th September, immediately following the examination start of the Cottam Solar Project on 5th and 6th September. I understood, having attended a preliminary meeting in July for the Gate Burton Energy Park Solar Project, EN01013, that the Inspectorate had previously stated that the 3 schemes (4 including Tillbridge Solar) totalling 10,000 acres, all proposed within a few miles of one another, could not be examined together and that the schemes would be examined independently on completely different timelines to enable interested parties to manage and read the vast amount of information and be able to make submissions accordingly. I feel obliged to put in writing my concerns as follows and, as I trust many other IPs will be feeling, this is completely unacceptable and unfair that these two programmes are running concurrently :- i) I will not have enough time to adequately assess each scheme and make my submissions, to attend hearings and participate in the process. ii) The documentation from the Planning Inspectorate, so far on the Gate Burton Solar Project alone, has consumed more of my time and my life than I ever deemed possible with work, home and family commitments and to date has become all-consuming attempting to keep on top of the process let alone the two further Projects of West Burton and Cottam Solar and is</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>causing me some disquiet to say the least and concern from my family. iii) I feel this is both prejudicial to me and is adding further confusion to an already difficult to follow process and, iv) as both the West Burton and Cottam Solar Projects, are being put forward by the same developer, Island Green Power, that they are gaining an unfair advantage in this respect as this puts an inordinate and unconscionable amount of pressure on me as an IP (and again other IPs) to produce comprehensible and co-ordinated responses by the due dates that are already arising. v) If each development is to be considered separately a reasonable period between each, which I think is fair and reasonable, would be a gap of circa 6 months – can the Planning Inspectorate review this matter ? and, vi) as these two developments are from the same company, Island Green Power, and would be within a mile or two of each other totalling alone a colossal 5,532 acres, (engulfing my village and neighbouring villages on 3 sides) and they are now both ready to be examined, why can't they be examined as ONE ? Can this be reviewed by the Planning Inspectorate ? vii) Based on all of the above it would appear that public participation in this process is inconsequential to the Inspectorate and this is of concern. I would welcome the Planning Inspectorates comments as a matter of some urgency please."</p>	
PM-02 [PDA-048]	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"On 10th August I received FOUR identical notification emails from NI Mail Distribution of the Preliminary Meeting (Rule 6 letter) Ref EN010132 stating the examination for Island Green Power West Burton Solar 1, 2 and 3 is starting on 7th September. I am dismayed to note this is immediately following the examination start of the Island Green Power Cottam Solar 1, 2 and 3 Project on 5th and 6th September. When I attended the Preliminary Meeting in July for the Gate Burton Energy Park Solar Project, EN01013, I understood the Inspectorate previously stated</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>these 3 schemes, which are affecting 30 communities, (4 schemes includes Tillbridge Solar), totalling 10,000 acres, and all proposed within a few miles of one another, could not be examined together. These schemes would be examined independently on completely different timelines to enable Interested Parties (IPs) to manage and read the multitudinous amount of information and be able to make submissions accordingly. 1. That these two schemes are going to be running concurrently, is discriminatory. To bestow Island Green Power with such an advantage and absolutely, unfairly, disadvantage Interested Parties and the affected communities in this way is unjust. 2. I will not have enough time to adequately assess each scheme, to make my submissions, to attend hearings and to participate in the process (unless I am awake 24 hours a day, seven days a week for an indefinite period) while endeavouring to honour my other commitments and lead a normal life ! 3. Trying to keep on top of all the original and updated documentation on the Planning Inspectorate's website purely for the Gate Burton Solar Project process is causing me some disquiet, notwithstanding Island Green Power's West Burton Solar site and the Cottam Solar site coming one on top of the other. 4. This decision also puts an inexcusable amount of pressure on me as an IP, and conceivably other IPs, to keep track of and produce comprehensible and co-ordinated responses by the due dates/deadlines for submissions now arising and to which project they relate with a high risk of losing track of where each one is in the process. 5. I conclude this to be both prejudicial to me and again possibly other IP's, and is adding further unnecessary confusion to an already difficult to follow process made worse by the use of similar project names....one named West Burton Solar and another developer naming their proposal Gate Burton Energy Park.</p>	

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>7. If each scheme is to be considered separately a sensible period between each, which I think is fair and reasonable, would be a gap of circa 6 months.</p> <p>9. It would appear that public participation in this process is of minor importance to the Inspectorate and this is of concern as, lamentably, the invitation to the Preliminary Meeting and Open Floor Hearing for the West Burton Solar Project scheduled for Thursday, 7th September is when people are at work and many will be unable to attend. The same applies for the Cottam Solar Project Preliminary Meeting dates."</p>	
PM-03 [PDA-048]	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	<p>"6. As the West Burton and Cottam Solar schemes are now both ready to be examined and have been submitted by the same company, a total colossal 5,532 acres, which will engulf my village and neighbouring villages on 3 sides, just WHY can't they be examined as ONE scheme ? These schemes are all in West Lindsey District Council and jointly affect us and the area.</p> <p>8. Also these 4 huge proposals referred to above, totalling 10,000 acres of BMV agricultural land, are not the only ones in Lincolnshire. There are at least 9 solar schemes proposed for this County alone.... the difference is that these 4 schemes are all within a few miles of each other"</p>	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to Patricia A Mitchell [PDB-009]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
PM-04	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	Following receipt of an email from the Examining Authority dated 11 October 2023 setting out the Revised draft Examination Timetable for the above I would like to point out that the dates set for the Hearings and Deadlines are still running correspondingly close to those of the other NSIPs currently in examination.	The Applicant notes this comment.
PM-05	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	The draft Examination Timetables for the NSIPs currently under examination, ie Cottam, West Burton and Gate Burton, also include a series of numbered Deadlines for receipt of written submissions and I am still concerned I and other interested parties will not have time to adequately assess each scheme and make submissions, attend hearings and participate in the process. A greater period of time needs to be provided between each NSIPs examination timetable to help residents prepare and become involved.	The Applicant notes this comment.
PM-06	Examination Process	Hearing Locations	Accessing the Aspen Suite, Hilton Doubletree, Brayford Wharf North, Lincoln for the West Burton meetings is difficult as I, and no doubt other people do not wish to pay costly car parking charges and consequently may not attend. In addition, this location is well away from the areas affected by these solar schemes and it would help if such meetings could be held, for example, at the Lincolnshire Showground where parking is free.	The Applicant notes this comment.





**Applicant's Response to Pam Duncan [PDA-047]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
PD-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable  Cumulative Development	"The plethora of applications affecting the area should really have all been heard together. We understand this will not happen and yet this examination is starting just two days after Cottam and Gate Burton is still in early stages. The documentation for each is considerable, complex and challenging to the lay person. How are we expected to be able to juggle these various examinations and prepare adequately? If they are going to be separate they should be decently spaced out."	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to Peri Hepburn [PDA-049]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
PH-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	"I feel it is an unfair advantage by Island green energy examining Burton solar and gare Burton simultaneously,are you disregarding public concern . Perhaps a timescale of sat 6 months between would be more acceptable in order to assess more thoroughly"	The Applicant notes this comment.

### Applicant's Response to Ray Stansfield [PDA-050]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
RS-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable Consultation	<p>"I am the clerk of a special group representing the Broxholme Parish meeting. The Parishioners unanimously mandated our Broxholme Solar group to be a channel of information and facilitators of engagement with all the Solar farm projects encircling us in West Lindsey. Currently we have in progress Gate Burton, Cottam and West Burton. The developers have chosen to crowd these consultations together in the school holidays, the peak of the harvest and middle of the tourist season. The Broxholme Solar Group dedicates itself to keeping the Parishioners properly informed and even we struggle to keep up and the lay person is completely swamped by this blizzard of requirements. I cannot keep our Parish in touch with events in any reasonable fashion and help them maintain any valid, authentic engagement with the consultations. We do not have enough time to properly digest the information and asses the implication of the proposals. We are confused and are excluded from the process by this avalanche of information. All the while this rolls forward we must attend work, complete the harvest and care for families. We are disadvantaged. Many of those affected in West Lindsey wanted all these projects to be considered as the one vast project it really represents. This was dismissed as an option yet now the developers are all ready seemingly in unison to go forward as one. It would seem that the Inspectorate is not placing citizen participation in the appropriate prominent position. We urge you to either spread out these consultations to allow proper engagement OR delay all then and address all the West Lindsey projects as the vast enterprise it really is."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>In respect of comments raised relating to consultation, please refer to response 'GEN-01' within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b>.</p>

**Applicant's Response to Ron Gore [PDA-051]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
RG-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"I am registered as an interested party for the 4 solar farm proposals both for myself and our Parish Council. I would like to register my objection to the inspectorate choosing to run the initial examination phase for 2 of these projects virtually in tandem. In order to be present at these meetings it requires me, like others, to take time off from work, which is a consideration the inspectorate should include in their timetabling as by lumping these meetings one immediately after the other only works to exclude interested parties. I am aware that you have already been advised of the very poorly arranged timetable by the 7000 acres representative group and we would expect some action such as changing the date of the West Burton proposal to occur at least 2-3 weeks after the Cottam project."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

**Applicant's Response to Sally Constable [PDA-052]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SC-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"These two solar projects (West Burton and Cottam) appear to be going through examination by the planning inspectorate at the same time. Every aspect of the development of these sights appears to be arranged in order to attain the effect of ensuring that public participation is prevented. It appears that there is a political aim to railroad through the planning applications in order to obtain a political objective of carbon net zero by 2050. There is literally a bombardment of reports that the average member of the public in rural lincolnshire could not access or respond to - especially in the time scale of all the schemes coming through together. The process is exceptionally confusing and appears to ensure only computer literate, educated members of the public have any opportunity for objection. Island Green seem to be using every possible tactic to gain an advantage - as a powerful commercial enterprise they leave the average working man currently resident in these areas of proposed development powerless to voice their objections. A reasonable time between the consideration of these sites so that people can obtain reports, read and study them and attend the meetings would be at least a year or otherwise the two sites should be examined together. I would have thought the planning inspectorate would be expected to be politically neutral and highly professional and to be expected to give a voice to the public of Lincolnshire without prejudice."</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to Shelley Rapley [PDA-053]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SR-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	I object to the 2 schemes being dealt with so close together, it is confusing enough already as a resident being affected by these schemes for the hearing for both to be held so close together when you refused to see these 4 applications for huge solar farms as one. I will not have time to be able to attend both, nor will I have enough time to make my representations known on either project with them being heard so close to each other. I ask that there be a minimum time between each proposal of 6 months in order for people to be able to understand what is happening and respond accordingly. They are gaining an unfair advantage by having these 2 hearings run almost side by side.	The Applicant notes this comment.

### Applicant's Response to Simon Skelton [PDA-054] & [PDA-055]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SSk-01 [PDA-054]	Cumulative Development	Separate Examination Process	<p>"The West Burton Solar Project is the third of four NSIP solar proposals in my neighbourhood to enter examination. The number and scale of proposed schemes in a short space of time is both distressing and confusing. These applications need to be examined with this unprecedented cumulative impact at the forefront. This is quite clearly one huge solar complex, with shared legal teams and proposed cable routes etc... Cottam and West Burton are by the same applicant and use the same project management.</p> <p>I understand the reasons behind the NSIP concept. But in this case, with an unprecedented 4 proposals covering 10,000 acres and all within a few miles, makes me think that there should have been a point where someone stepped in and took an holistic overview of the potential devastating effects of scale.</p> <p>I ask when does human compassion and common sense come into it? Is 4 NSIP developments acceptable in one area, but 5 is not? Or can the whole country be potentially covered in solar panels and batteries as long as the developers have completed all their reports? The need and consequences of these schemes is not backed by any thorough technical strategy. It seems more like "suck it and see!" I am extremely concerned by the sequence of events up to now, and strongly feel that no area deserves this scale of retrograde change and I believe that when given the facts, most people would agree. I look forward to a fair examination and that I am able to demonstrate to the Examining Authority the serious issues with this scheme."</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.</p> <p>A cumulative effects assessment has been prepared for the Application within the <b>Environmental Statement [APP-039 to APP-061]</b>. Cumulative effects assessments for each environmental topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with other identified NSIPs in the local area (see paragraph 2.5.9 of <b>6.2.2 Environmental Statement - Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-040]</b>).</p> <p>This assessment has been carried out in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.
SSk-02 [PDA-054]	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"Could the examinations be staggered by 6 months to level the playing field, instead of merely days between Cottam and West Burton. The four NSIP proposals are not the only ones in Lincolnshire, there are 10 giant solar farms proposed for this county. These four schemes are uniquely within a few miles of each other. The current examination timetable would be impossible to keep up with and participate in. Many residents are affected by all four schemes and their cumulative impact. The dash for ground mounted solar seems to be an opportunistic free for all, with its inefficiencies seldom made public. This unparalleled amount of proposed development in one area should not have gone unchecked. The potential level of harm has now been compounded to unthinkable proportions with residents now having 4 schemes to contend with."</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>A cumulative effects assessment has been prepared for the Application within the <b>Environmental Statement [APP-039 to APP-061]</b>. Cumulative effects assessments for each environmental topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with other identified NSIPs in the local area (see paragraph 2.5.9 of <b>6.2.2 Environmental Statement - Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-040]</b>).</p> <p>This assessment has been carried out in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES</p>



Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.
SSk-03 [PDA-054]	Consultations	Public Engagement	Early Developer meetings with the Planning Inspectorate which excluded the communities affected, makes me think that local views are not considered important. This all feels very undemocratic. Public consultation came far too late in the process, and when it did the developer just told us what we wanted to hear. This part of the process is demonstrably flawed.	The Applicant refers to the response to MP-02 above.
SSk-04 [PDA-055]	Examination Process	Examination Timetable  Cumulative Development	I received my rule 6 letter today for the West Burton Solar Project. Could you please explain to me why the examination timetable runs almost in parallel to the supposedly separate Cottam Solar Project, also by Island Green Power. Are these, quite rightfully now being treated as one project? These two applications were submitted many weeks apart, but are now to be examined at the same time, but by different Examining Authorities. If they are still to be examined separately, then why were we advised that the 4 solar NSIPs that are proposed within a few miles of each other. West Burton, Cottam, Gate Burton and Tillbridge would have staggered examinations to enable fair community participation. The message received today has been a real kick in the teeth and signals that local engagement is not considered important in this process. This issue needs to be addressed as it is clearly unfair to expect the public to engage fully on multiple NSIPs without breathing space between hearings and deadlines. 6 months between each Examination to allow full participation would be fair, and is not a lot to ask? One NSIP is difficult enough to get involved with but four at once would be impossible for most and is therefore undeniably wrong. Please reconsider this timetable. Or as all four are all linked together, examine them as one?	The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Applicant's Response to Simon Skelton [PDB-010]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SSk-05	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>Firstly, I appreciate the adjournment of the West Burton Solar Project Preliminary meeting and the consequential delay of the Examination start. However the revised draft timetable unfortunately still does not allow residents affected by multiple solar NSIPs to engage fairly.</p> <p>There appears to be a fundamental planning issue at the Planning Inspectorate with this cluster of deadlines. I would expect these to be more fairly spaced in consideration for the public that are being terrorised by these life changing proposals and wish their voices to be heard. How are we able to effectively meet these extremely closely spaced deadlines covering complex issues, multiple sites and topics, and ExAs questions?</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.
SSk-06	Examination Process	Hearing Locations	As mentioned to the other Examining Authorities, the use of Lincoln city facilities (Double Tree Hilton) is costly and inconvenient to those affected, these three soon to be four solar NSIP proposals are in the Gainsborough, not Lincoln area and the use of the Lincolnshire Showground would be a far more sensible option	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to Simon Stiles [PDA-056]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SSt-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>it is with much disquiet that I have learned the two enquiries, as above, are to run concurrently. I believe that the 4 local solar projects are exploiting a loop hole in the law and the regulations by which you must work, to circumvent a proper consideration by yourself of the impact of the one massive project. Having to accept that this is the case, I had understood that the four projects would be examined in due time, separately, in order to give we villagers who are effected by the development a proper chance to engage in each process. For those of us who have never been involved in planning decisions this is a remarkably complicated process and trying to keep up with two which are to run concurrently is at best extremely unfair. Please will you reconsider the timings of each enquiry or consider all three as a whole in order to give we lay people a chance to understand the process.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

### Applicant's Response to Sue Bingham [PDA-057]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
SB-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable Cumulative Development	<p>"I write regarding the above date for examination of the West Burton solar scheme which is imminent after the Cottam solar examination dates. I find the reasoning for singular project examination to be disingenuous as the dates are so close together as to be very confusing and not giving time for the public to take in the vast amount of submissions and information. If the schemes are ready should they not be presented as one? All the schemes in such a small area should be examined as one as they will have such a huge impact on our peaceful, rural area and communities. If examined separately, they should be at least six months apart to give the public more time to understand everything. I feel we are being bamboozled with information, confused by all the different schemes and it is difficult to keep up with submission dates and actually we all have busy lives at the best of times without trying to fit all this in. Some people are excluded from giving their opinions because of the technology involved and others by busy working lives. I find it appalling that our communities are under such threats."</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.</p> <p>In respect of the comments relating to impacts on the landscape character of the area, and communities, the Applicant refers the respondent to its responses at reference 'LCC-21' and 'NE-21' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b>.</p>

**Applicant's Response to Tracy Adderley [PDA-058]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TA-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable Cumulative Development	<p>"The application should be examined along with all the others that are being submitted by IGP and all its subsidiaries to cover all projects (i.e. c. 10,000 acres) as they all affect West Lindsey DC and its inhabitants. I believe that the process and the applications are fundamentally flawed because the scale and number of these schemes in a short space of time does not enable people to engage with the process. Furthermore two of the schemes are being proposed by the same developer, Island Green Power, which shows they are joined schemes. If these projects are to be considered individually a greater period of time needs to be provided between each examination to help residents prepare and become involved. The developers have had several years to prepare their submissions (even though late additions are being submitted) whereas we, as individuals, have a few months to object and the sheer volume of documents and the complexity of them make it impossible for us, as laymen, to adequately understand. The above aspects are confusing in their own right, but it is made worse by one of the projects being named West Burton Solar Project and another developer branding their proposal as Gate Burton Energy Park. This use of similar names only adds to the confusion. It is easy to see that with these proposals running at roughly the same time, confusion could prevent opposition and cause the general public to lose track of where each one is in the process. Also, these 4 huge proposals are not the only ones in Lincolnshire (there are at least 9 proposed for this county alone). The difference is that these 4 schemes, are all within a few miles of each other."</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.</p> <p>A cumulative effects assessment has been prepared for the Application within the <b>Environmental Statement [APP-039 to APP-061]</b>. Cumulative effects assessments for each environmental topic are set out in each of the ES Chapters and include the assessment of the impacts of the Scheme cumulatively with other identified NSIPs in the local area (see paragraph 2.5.9 of <b>6.2.2 Environmental Statement - Chapter 2 EIA Process and Methodology [APP-040]</b>).</p> <p>This assessment has been carried out in accordance with Schedule 4 of the 2017 EIA Regulations and PINS Advice Note 17. The mitigation measures set out across the ES</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
				therefore account for anticipated cumulative effects.

**Applicant's Response to Wendy and William Rose [PDA-059]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
WWR-01	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	We have been very concerned to receive notice that the examination for West Burton Solar is starting on 7th September, immediately following the examination start of the Cottam Solar Project on the 5th and 6th September. The inspectorate had previously stated that the schemes could not be examined together and that the schemes would be examined independently on completely different timelines to enable interested parties to manage the vast amounts of information and make submissions. We are part of the 7000 Acres Group and understand they have written to the inspectorate about how they find it completely unacceptable that the two programmes appear to be running concurrently. We feel Island Green Power are gaining an unfair advantage as the whole process is too complex and confusing to run concurrently. It feels as if the public's point of view is unimportant. If each development was to be considered separately a 6-month gap would be much more suitable.	The Applicant notes this comment.

**Applicant's Response to West Lindsey District Council [PDA-060 and PDB-012]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
WLDC-01	Examination Process	No Provision for Written Representations	<p>"West Lindsey District Council notes the draft examination timetable proposed within the 'rule 6' letter. We do have concerns with the examination programme as proposed and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss these matters further within the Preliminary Hearing.</p> <p>The timetable as drafted does not currently appear to make provision for the submission of Written Representations. A key document to be used by a relevant authority, such a document will require Committee scrutiny and we therefore seek early clarity on this matter in order we can satisfactorily make provisions to adhere to any deadline, and within the Committee schedule."</p>	The Applicant notes this comment. Deadline 1A has since been inserted into the examination timetable, which addresses the submission of written representations.
WLDC-02	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>"Secondly, we are concerned that the programme as proposed, runs almost parallel to the Cottam Solar examination and concurrently with the Gate Burton Solar Examination that is already underway. As proposed, this results in a number of tensions which will pose considerable strain on bodies that wish to actively participate, including the public and ourselves in the role of the relevant planning authority (this has already commenced – this Procedural Deadline A has fallen during Hearings taking place in the Gate Burton examination). There are similar conflicts with the need to provide an LIR (and WR?) within the following week of a similar deadline requirement for Cottam. Consecutive Cottam and West Burton Hearings in December will limit the Authority's ability to adequately prepare for the hearings (we will be in the Cottam Hearing in the week leading up to the West Burton Hearing), and to prepare post-hearing submissions after (we will be in the West Burton Hearings when putting together our written</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.



Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			submissions for Cottam). Deadline 3 falls on the same day for Gate Burton's deadline 7. We would therefore welcome the opportunity to identify where such tensions may exist and opportunities to consider how they can be addressed within the 6 month examination period. We attach a combined timetable that may assist with such discussions."	
WLDC-03	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>WLDC notes the revised draft Examination Timetable within Appendix C of the Rule 6 letter (dates 11/10/2023). WLDC does, however, wish to raise several significant matters relating to the draft timetable.</p> <p>Submission deadline for Local Impact Reports and Written Representations. WLDC notes that the draft deadline for the Local Impact Report (LIR) is at Deadline 1 on Friday 24th November 2023 and for Written Representations (WR) on Deadline 1A on Thursday 7th December 2023.</p> <p>WLDC intend to submit both an LIR pursuant to section 60 of the Planning Act 2008 and a WR.</p> <p>Due to local authority processes and committee calendars, the only committee date available to ratify both reports is Tuesday 5th December 2023. Both WLDCs LIR and WR are scheduled to be considered at that committee.</p> <p>As a consequence, WLDC are unable to submit an LIR in accordance with Deadline 1 and, due to postcommittee processes, will also be unable to submit an approved LIR in accordance with Deadline 1A.</p> <p>WLDC therefore request that the deadline for the submission of both the LIR and WR be rescheduled for Deadline 2 on Friday 15th December 2023.</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>WLDC accepts that such an amendment to the programme will result in these documents being submitted slightly later than scheduled in the draft timetable; however, the timescale from the commencement of the examination is akin to many DCO projects (including the Cottam Solar Project, which timetabled a period of 6 weeks following the commencement of the examination for the submission of LIRs and WRs). Should the ExA accept WLDCs suggestion, a period of over 20 weeks remains in the examination timetable</p>	
WLDC-04	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) WLDC notes that the ISH1 is scheduled for the day following the Preliminary Meeting (9th November 2023) and the matters to be discussed comprise the scope of the proposed development, need, site selection and alternatives and environmental matters.</p> <p>The above matters are ones that are very likely to be of concern to WLDC; however, due to the hearing being held prior to the issue of WLDC's LIR and WR (both in relation to the revised draft timetable and WLDC's committee date) , officers will be significantly restricted in expressing views and contributing meaningfully to ISH1. The approval of the LIR and WR will represent the formal views of WLDC and these need to be formally ratified by the Council's committee in accordance with our scheme of delegation. In the absence of that formal approval, the ability of officers to contribute will be limited.</p> <p>WLDC therefore wishes to confirm that it intends to participate in ISH1, but that the extent to which it will be able to express views at this stage will be limited, and will need to defer to post-hearing submissions to be made.</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
WLDC-04	Examination Process	Examination Timetable	<p>General comments WLDC wish to note that, despite an adjournment to the Examination of the West Burton Solar Project application due to issues with the alignment and overlap with that of other NSIP projects, the revised draft Examination Timetable still retains many clashes in terms of deadlines and hearings. Examples of such unalignment include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Deadline 1 is scheduled in the same week as Deadline 5 for the Gate Burton Energy Park; and Deadline 2 for the Cottam Solar Project;</li> <li>- Deadline 1A is scheduled during the week of hearings being held in association with the Cottam Solar Project</li> <li>- Deadline 2 is scheduled the immediate day following Deadline 6 for the Gate Burton Energy Park examination</li> <li>- Deadline 3 is scheduled the day immediately before Deadline 7 for the Gate Burton Energy Park examination.</li> </ul> <p>The close proximity of these deadlines will compromise the preparation of material to be provide by WLDC and it is not understood why these deadlines could not have been scheduled in a manner that provided more time for all parties involved in the examination.</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.

### 3 The Applicant's Responses to Additional Submissions by Interested Parties

**Table 3.1: Applicant's Response to Health and Safety Executive [AS-008]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
HSE-01	Examination Process	Attendance at Preliminary Meeting and Open Floor Hearing	HSE can confirm that our advice remains the same as that given in our previous S42 advice and as such have no further comments to make.	The Applicant notes this comment.  The Applicant's response to Section 42 comments made by the Health and Safety Executive is available at pg.463 of <b>5.13 Consultation Report - Appendix 5.13 - Section 42 Applicant Response [APP-037]</b> .
HSE-02	Draft DCO	Consultation with HSE	HSE has noted the contents of the draft Development Consent Order for the West Burton Solar Project. In particular the references contained in Schedule 2 (6) (3).  There is no statutory requirement to consult HSE in relation to a Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) and HSE does not provide comment on them. HSE ask that the requirements in Schedule 2 (6) (3) and any other references to HSE consultation/approval of the BSMP are removed from the Development Consent Order. HSE is a consultation body, for the purposes of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008), providing public safety advice in respect of proposed NSIPs. HSE's	Requirement 6 (3) of Schedule 2 to of the draft DCO has been updated accordingly for Deadline 1 at <b>3.1_A Draft Development Consent Order [EN010132/EX1/WB3.1_A]</b> .

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>role as a statutory consultee in the planning process is set out on the Planning Inspectorate website. HSE has agreed with the Planning Inspectorate that Advice Note 11 annex G will be amended to further clarify the position regarding BSMP.</p>	

**Table 3.2: Applicant's Response to Tony Fields [AS-009]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TFi-01	Examination Process	Examination Process	I believe that not enough time and information have been given to the local public with regards to all these solar projects. We are confused and bewildered by all these solar projects being submitted at similar time scales. The inspectorate should take all these projects and treat them as one whole project. After all the blot and devastation on the Lincolnshire landscape and wildlife will be the same. If the solar projects are taken individually then a period of six months should be sufficient for the local community to be informed and make judgements	The Applicant notes this comment and refers to its response to AS-01 above.

**Table 3.3: Applicant's Response to Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board [AS-010]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
TVIDB-01	Examination Process	Attendance at Preliminary Meeting and Open Floor Hearing	<p>"I apologize, as I realize that we have missed the original deadline date for requesting to attend the Preliminary Meeting and Open Floor Hearing on 7th September.</p> <p>Please would it still be possible for myself to attend the Preliminary Meeting and for my colleague Darren Cowling to attend both the Preliminary Meeting and Open Floor Hearing on 7th September.</p> <p>I have attached my colleague [REDACTED] consultation feedback which was sent through to Dalcour Maclaren on the 5th August 2022, as well as an area plan showing the project boundary in relation to Trent Valley IDB maintained watercourses."</p>	The Applicant notes this comment.
TVIDB-02	Consultation	Previous Consultation with Applicant	<p>"Please find GIS shape files attached for Trent Valley IDB and Isle of Axholme and North Nottinghamshire Water Level Management Board. You have been in touch regarding numerous parcels of land and we felt that sharing these shape files was the most efficient way of providing a clear picture of watercourses and pumping station within our remit. Apologies for the delay. I also attach a response from our Planning and Development Control Officer, Darren Cowling, sent on the 3rd of August. This</p>	The Applicant notes this comment, and that this refers to correspondence between Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board and the Applicant in August 2022. The Applicant is committed to ensuring sufficient protective provisions are included in <b>3.1 Draft Development Consent Order [EN010132/EX1/WB3.1_A]</b> .

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			contains details of the Board's requirements for works undertaken in proximity to Board maintained watercourses. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any queries."	



**Table 3.4: Applicant's Response to Richard Farley [AS-011]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
RFa-01	Examination Process	Examination Process	Firstly as a resident affected by these proposals I greatly appreciate your action to adjourn proceedings on the West Burton Project to give opportunity for breathing space for all concerned.	The applicant notes this comment.
RFa-02	General	Cumulative Development Consultation	<p>Alarmingly the overall total solar development from the 5 major proposals in NE Lincolnshire is now approaching 15000 acres which is an unbelievable area and will obviously be disastrous for the local community. The mass of representations already submitted will clearly cover the many general objections so I will not repeat them again here. However, there are certain human and physical issues that may have been somewhat understated which I would like to emphasise.</p> <p>I have to say that overall there is a general feeling from the local community, which emanates from the manner these proposals are being projected and processed, in that we are going to have little say on the outcome. We are simply being told, by the Developers, what their intentions are with little interest shown for the impact it will have on the area, environment and our lives. The message that implicitly comes across is that it's all for the good of the nation and our charge towards zero</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above with regard to the cumulative scale of development and the examination process.</p> <p>The Applicant refers to its response to MP-02 with regard to consultation process and level of response.</p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			<p>emissions. The local population clearly don't matter.</p> <p>This is totally at odds with the Prime Minister's message that of 'Consent not Imposition' when he spoke of on shore wind turbines during his review on how we achieve net zero by 2050.</p>	
RFa-03	Principle of Development	Cumulative Development Grid Connection	I do believe that it is difficult to imagine the scale of these overall proposals; communities up and down the country have talked about 'massive' solar farms being developed in their area but these are rarely much greater than 250 acres, so on that scale you would have to rate the NE Lincolnshire proposals as galactic! But it is not only the size it is also the sheer density of their construction, the farms are being 'shoe horned' into a relatively small area in order to achieve savings utilising the grid connections of the three abandoned power stations.	<p>The Applicant refers to its response to AS-01 above.</p> <p>In respect of the comments relating to grid connection and the siting of the NSIPs, the Applicant refers the respondent to its responses at reference 'SIPC-05' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b>.</p>
RFa-04	Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation	Impact on Residential Amenity Property Value Community Benefits	Please imagine what impact this will have on the immediate area. Villages and communities that have existed, based on agriculture, for 1000 years will be destroyed, our hamlet Brampton was even mentioned in the Domesday book! No one will want to live in an industrial desert, property values will plummet and the whole area will essentially become sidelined. With no thought of compensation or mitigation being offered, apart	<p>In respect of these comments regarding the socio-economic environment, the Applicant refers the respondent to its responses at reference 'STR-02', 'STR-03', 'STR-04', and 'STR-07' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b>.</p> <p>Separately, as it is not a part of the DCO Application, paragraph 4.8.1 of <b>7.5 Planning</b></p>

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
			from screening and footpaths, the power companies will literally be destroying the local lives, wellbeing and property investment within the 30+ villages closely affected by the proposals. Yet quite to the contrary the power companies are offering vast rents to land owners and farmers in order to utilise their land for the solar farms. Where is the equity in that?	<b>Statement [APP-313]</b> explains that the Applicant is committed to providing a Community Benefit Fund.
RFa-05	General	Consultation Response	It is small wonder then that the vast majority of the local population are opposed to these schemes, a fact that was actually recognised in the Cottam and West Burton Phase 2 Consultation Summary report dated September 2022 where they reported 77% were opposed and only 12% supported the proposals. Of course since then 3 more schemes have been proposed so I am certain that the extent of objection will have increased significantly.	The Applicant refers to its response to MP-02 above.
RFa-06	Ecology and Biodiversity	National Depletion of Natural Places	In conclusion, it is ironic that I am making these concerns to you at the very time that a wildlife and state of nature report has just been published which 'highlights that the UK is one of the most nature depleted places on the planet'. Small wonder we are where we are, when consideration is being given to turning over vast areas of farmland into a grossly inefficient land use for power sources.	The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding hedgerows, ecology and biodiversity issues at reference 'ECO-01' to 'ECO-04' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b> .

**Table 3.5: Applicant's Response to Richard Whiting [AS-012]**

Reference	Theme	Issue	Summary of Issue Raised	Applicant's Response
RWh-01	Examination Process	Examination Process	<p>Firstly it is far too large and is in danger of surrounding our village [Brampton] The panels are large and unsightly.</p> <p>Who wants to live in a community surrounded by unsightly solar panels.</p>	<p>The Applicant points the Party to its response to issues regarding landscape at reference 'LAN-01' to 'LAN-05' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b>.</p>
RWh-02	Soils and Agriculture Alternatives and Design Evolution	Use of agricultural land  Locating solar on rooftops  Community benefits	<p>Vast areas of good agricultural land are being consumed, why not fit them to local houses and buildings and give something back to the local community!</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its response to CF-02 above with regard to locating solar on agricultural land versus rooftops.</p> <p>The Applicant points the Party to its response to benefits of the Scheme at reference '7A-09' as contained within <b>WB8.1.2 The Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [EN010132/EX1/WB8.1.2]</b>.</p>
RWh-03	General	Consultation	Who will listen to our objections ?	<p>The Applicant refers to its response to MP-02 above.</p>